arXiv:1209.6422v1 [math.KT] 28 Sep 2012

Positivity in T-Equivariant K-theory of flag varieties associated to Kac-Moody groups

Shrawan Kumar
(with an appendix by M. Kashiwara)

October 1, 2012

1 Introduction

Let G be any symmetrizable Kac-Moody group over $\mathbb{C}$ completed along the negative roots and $G^{\min} \subset G$ be the 'minimal' Kac-Moody group. Let B be the standard (positive) Borel subgroup, B^- the standard negative Borel subgroup, $H = B \cap B^-$ the standard maximal torus and W the Weyl group. Let $\bar{X} = G/B$ be the 'thick' flag variety (introduced by Kashiwara) which contains the standard KM flag ind-variety $X = G^{\min}/B$. Let T be the quotient torus $H/Z(G^{\min})$, where $Z(G^{\min})$ is the center of $G^{\min}$. Then, the action of H on $\bar{X}$ (and X) descends to an action of T. We denote the representation ring of T by $R(T)$. For any $w \in W$, we have the Schubert cell $C_w := BwB/B \subset X$, the Schubert variety $X_w := \overline{C_w} \subset X$, the opposite Schubert cell $C^w := B^-wB/B \subset \bar{X}$, and the opposite Schubert variety $X^w := \overline{C^w} \subset \bar{X}$.

Let $K_T^{\mathrm{top}}(X)$ be the T-equivariant topological K-group of the ind-variety X. Let $\{\psi^w\}_{w\in W}$ be the 'basis' of $K_T^{\mathrm{top}}(X)$ given by Kostant-Kumar [KK, §3]. (Actually our ψ^w is a slight twist of their basis.)

Express the product in topological K-theory $K_T^{\mathrm{top}}(X)$:

$$\psi^u \cdot \psi^v = \sum_w p_{u,v}^w \psi^w, \quad \text{for } p_{u,v}^w \in R(T).$$

Then, the following result is our main theorem (cf. Theorem 4.13). This generalizes one of the main results of Anderson-Griffeth-Miller [AGM, Corollary 5.2] (which was conjectured earlier by Graham-Kumar [GK, Conjecture 3.1]) from the finite to any symmetrizable Kac-Moody case.

1.1 Theorem. *For any $u, v, w \in W$,*

$$(-1)^{\ell(u)+\ell(v)+\ell(w)}\, p_{u,v}^w \in \mathbb{Z}_+[(e^{-\alpha_1} - 1), \dots, (e^{-\alpha_r} - 1)],$$

where $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r\}$ are the simple roots.

As an immediate consequence of the above theorem (by evaluating at 1), we obtain the following result (cf. Corollary 4.14) which generalizes one of the main results of Brion [B] (conjectured by A.S. Buch) from the finite to any symmetrizable Kac-Moody case.

1.2 Corollary. *For any $u, v, w \in W$,*

$$(-1)^{\ell(u)+\ell(v)+\ell(w)}\, a^w_{u,v} \in \mathbb{Z}_+,$$

where $a^w_{u,v}$ are the structure constants of the product in $K^{\mathrm{top}}(X)$ under the basis $\psi^w_o := 1 \otimes \psi^w$.

The proof relies heavily on algebro-geometric techniques. We realize the structure constants $p^w_{u,v}$ as the coproduct structure constants in the structure sheaf basis $\{\mathscr{O}_{X_w}\}_{w\in W}$ of the T-equivariant K-group $K^T_o(X)$ of finitely supported T-equivariant coherent sheaves on X (cf Proposition 4.1). Let $K^0_T(\bar{X})$ denote the Grothendieck group of T-equivariant coherent $\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}$-modules $\mathcal{S}$. Then, there is a 'natural' pairing (cf. Section 3)

$$\langle\, ,\, \rangle : K^0_T(\bar{X}) \otimes K^T_0(X) \to R(T),$$

coming from the T-equivariant Euler-Poincaré characteristic. Define the T-equivariant coherent sheaf $\xi^u := e^{-\rho}\mathcal{L}(\rho)\omega_{X^u}$ on $\bar{X}$, where

$$\omega_{X^u} := \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}) \otimes \mathcal{L}(-2\rho)$$

is the dualizing sheaf of X^u. For any character e^λ of H, let $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ be the G-equivariant line bundle on $\bar{X}$ associated to the character $e^{-\lambda}$ of H. We show that the basis $\{[\xi^w]\}$ is dual to the basis $\{[\mathscr{O}_{X_w}]\}_{w\in W}$ under the above pairing (cf. Proposition 3.5).

Following [AGM], we define the 'mixing group' Γ in Definition 4.6. The following is our main technical result (cf. Theorem 4.10). The proof of its two parts are given in Sections 5 and 9 respectively. (We refer to Section 4 for various unexplained notation here.)

1.3 Theorem. *(a) For general $\gamma \in \Gamma$, any $u, v, w \in W$, and $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_r) \in [N]^r$,*

$$\mathscr{T}or_i^{\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\bar{Y}}}}\big(\pi^*(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mathbf{j}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_\mathbf{j})) \otimes (\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v}), \gamma_*\tilde{\Delta}_*\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{X}_w}\big) = 0, \quad \textit{for all } i > 0.$$

$$(b) \qquad H^p\big(\tilde{\bar{Y}}, \pi^*(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mathbf{j}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_\mathbf{j})) \otimes (\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v}) \otimes \gamma_*\tilde{\Delta}_*\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{X}_w}\big) = 0$$

for all $p \neq |\mathbf{j}| + \ell(w) - (\ell(u) + \ell(v))$, where $|\mathbf{j}| = \sum_{i=1}^r j_i$.

From the connectedness of Γ (cf. Lemma 4.8), we get the following result as an immediate corollary of the above theorem (cf. Corollary 4.11), where $c^w_{u,v}(\mathbf{j})$ is defined by the identity (19).

1.4 Corollary.

$$(-1)^{\ell(w)-\ell(u)-\ell(v)+|\mathbf{j}|} c^w_{u,v}(\mathbf{j}) \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

From the above result, one easily obtains our main theorem (Theorem 1.1).

Rest of the paper is devoted to prove Theorem 1.3.

In Section 5, we prove various local Ext and Tor vanishing results crucially using the 'Acyclicity Lemma' of Peskine-Szpiro (cf. Corollary 5.3). The following is our one of the main results of this section (cf. Propositions 5.1 and 5.4).

1.5 Proposition. *For any* $u, w \in W$*,*

$$\mathscr{E}xt^j_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{X_w}) = 0, \quad \text{for all } j \neq \ell(u).$$

Thus,

$$\mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\xi^u, \mathscr{O}_{X_w}) = 0, \quad \text{for all } j > 0.$$

This proposition allows us to prove Theorem 1.3 (a).

We also prove the following local Tor vanishing result (cf. Lemma 5.5), which is a certain cohomological analogue of the proper intersection property of X^u with X_w.

1.6 Lemma. *For any* $u, w \in W$*,*

$$\mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{X_w}) = 0, \qquad \text{for all } j > 0.$$

In Section 6 we show that the Richardson varieties $X_w^v := X_w \cap X^v \subset \bar{X}$ are irreducible, normal and Cohen-Macaulay, for short CM (cf. Proposition 6.5). Then, we construct a desingularization Z_w^v of X_w^v (cf Theorem 6.7). In this section, we prove that various maps appearing in the big diagram in Section 7 are smooth or flat morphisms.

In Section 7, we introduce the crucial irreducible scheme $\mathcal{Z}$ and its desingularization $f : \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \to \mathcal{Z}$. We also introduce a diviser $\partial\mathcal{Z}$ of $\mathcal{Z}$ and show that $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\partial\mathcal{Z}$ are CM (cf. Propositions 7.4 and 7.6 respectively). We further show that $\mathcal{Z}$ is normal (cf. Lemma 7.5).

In Section 8, we determine the dualizing sheaves of $\mathcal{Z}$ (cf. Lemma 8.2), $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ (cf. Lemma 8.6) and the Richardson varieties X_w^v (cf. Lemma 8.5). This allows us to use the relative Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem (cf. Theorem 8.10) to obtain the following two crucial vanishing results (cf. Proposition 8.11 and Theorem 8.12 respectively).

1.7 Proposition. *For the morphism* $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \to \bar{\Gamma}$ *(cf. the big diagram in Section 7),*

$$R^p\tilde{\pi}_*(\omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})) = 0, \ \text{for all } p > 0,$$

where $\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} := f^{-1}(\partial\mathcal{Z})$*.*

1.8 Theorem. *For the morphism* $f : \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \to \mathcal{Z}$*,*

(a) $R^p f_*\left(\omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})\right) = 0$*, for all* $p > 0$*, and*

(b) $f_*(\omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})) = \omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial\mathcal{Z})$*.*

Now the stage is set to prove our main technical Theorem 1.3 (b), which is achieved in Section 9.

Finally, we have included an appendix by M. Kashiwara where he determines the dualizing sheaf of X^u.

An informed reader will notice many ideas taken from very interesting papers [B] and [AGM] by Brion and Anderson-Griffeth-Miller respectively. However, there are several technical difficulties to deal with arising from the infinite dimensional setup, which has required various different formulations and more involved proofs. Some of the mazor differences are:

(1) In the finite case one just works with the opposite Schubert varieties X^u and their very explicit BSDH desingularizations which allows an easy calculation of the dualizing sheaf of the analogue of $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$. In our general symmetrizable Kac-Moody set up, we need to consider the Richardson varieties X_w^u and their desingularizations Z_w^u. Our desingularization Z_w^u is not as explicit as the BSDH desingularization. Then, we need to draw upon the result due to Kumar-Schwede [KuS] that X_w^u have Kawamata log terminal singularities and use this result to calculate the dualizing sheaf of $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$.

(2) Instead of considering just one flag variety in the finite case, we need to consider the 'thick' flag variety and the standard ind flag variety and the pairing between them. Moreover, the identification of the basis of $K_T^0(\bar{X})$ dual to the basis of $K_0^T(X)$ given by the structure sheaf of the Schubert varieties X_w is more delicate.

(3) In the finite case one uses Kleiman's transversality result for the flag variety X. In our infinite case, to circumvent the absence of Kleiman's transversality result, we needed to prove various local Ext and Tor vanishing results.

We feel that some of the local Ext and Tor vanishing results and the results on the geometry of Ricahrdson varieties (including their desingularization) proved in this paper are of independent interest.

Acknowledgements. I am very grateful to M. Kashiwara for many helpful correspondences, for carefully reading a large part of the paper and making various suggestions for improvement in the exposition, and determining the dualizing sheaf of the opposite Schubert varieties (contained in the appendix by him). It is my pleasure to thank M. Brion for pointing out his work on the construction of a desingularization of Richardson varieties in the finite case and some suggestions on an earlier draft of this paper, to N. Mohan Kumar for pointing out the 'acyclicity lemma' of Peskine-Szpiro (which was also pointed out by Dima Arinkin) and his help with the proof of Theorem 9.1 and some other helpful conversations, and to E. Vasserot for going through the paper. This work was supported partially by the NSF grants.

2 Notation

We take the base field to be the field of complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$. By a variety, we mean an algebraic variety over $\mathbb{C}$, which is reduced but not necessarily irreducible.

Let G be any symmetrizable Kac-Moody group over $\mathbb{C}$ completed along the negative roots (as opposed to completed along the positive roots as in [K, Chapter 6]) and $G^{\min} \subset G$ be the 'minimal' Kac-Moody group as in [K, §7.4]. Let B be the standard (positive) Borel subgroup, B^- the standard negative Borel subgroup, $H = B \cap B^-$ the standard maximal torus and W the Weyl group (cf. [K, Chapter 6]). Let

$$\bar{X} = G/B$$

be the 'thick' flag variety which contains the standard KM-flag variety

$$X = G^{\min}/B.$$

If G is not of finite type, $\bar{X}$ is an infinite dimensional non quasi-compact scheme (cf. [Ka, §4]) and X is an ind-projective variety (cf. [K, §7.1]). The group $G^{\min}$; in particular, maximal torus H acts on $\bar{X}$ and X. Let T be the quotient $H/Z(G^{\min})$, where $Z(G^{\min})$ is the center of $G^{\min}$. (Recall that, by [K, Lemma 6.2.9(c)], $Z(G^{\min}) = \{h \in H : e^{\alpha_i}(h) = 1$ for all the simple roots $\alpha_i\}$.) Then, the action of H on $\bar{X}$ (and X) descends to an action of T.

For any $w \in W$, we have the Schubert cell

$$C_w := BwB/B \subset X,$$

the Schubert variety

$$X_w := \overline{C_w} \subset X,$$

the opposite Schubert cell

$$C^w := B^- wB/B \subset \bar{X},$$

and the opposite Schubert variety

$$X^w := \overline{C^w} \subset \bar{X},$$

all endowed with the reduced subscheme structures. Then, X_w is a (finite dimensional) irreducible projective subvariety of X and X^w is a finite codimensional irreducible subscheme of $\bar{X}$ (cf. [K, Section 7.1] and [Ka, §4]). For any integral weight λ (i.e., any character e^λ of H), we have a G-equivariant line bundle $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ on $\bar{X}$ associated to the character $e^{-\lambda}$ of H. We denote the representation ring of T by $R(T)$.

Let $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r\} \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ be the set of simple roots, $\{\alpha_1^\vee, \dots, \alpha_r^\vee\} \subset \mathfrak{h}$ the set of simple coroots and $\{s_1, \dots, s_r\} \subset W$ the corresponding simple reflections, where $\mathfrak{h} = \operatorname{Lie} H$. Let $\rho \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ be any integral weight satisfying

$$\rho(\alpha_i^\vee) = 1, \quad \text{for all} \quad 1 \le i \le r.$$

When G is a finite dimensional semisimple group, ρ is unique, but for a general Kac-Moody group G, it may not be unique.

For any $v \le w \in W$, consider the *Richardson variety*

$$X_w^v := X^v \cap X_w \subset X$$

and its boundary

$$\partial X_w^v := (\partial X^v) \cap X_w$$

both endowed with the reduced subvariety structures, where $\partial X^v := X^v \backslash (C^v)$. We also set $\partial X_w := X_w \backslash C_w$. (By [KuS, Proposition 5.3], X_w^v and ∂X_w^v, endowed with the scheme theoretic intersection structure, are Frobenius split in char. $p > 0$; in particular, they are rduced.)

3 Identification of the dual of the structure sheaf basis

3.1 Definition. For a quasi-compact scheme Y, an $\mathcal{O}_Y$-module $\mathcal{S}$ is called *coherent* if it is finitely presented as an $\mathcal{O}_Y$-module and any $\mathcal{O}_Y$-submodule of finite type admits a finite presentation.

An $\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}$-module $\mathcal{S}$ is called *coherent* if $\mathcal{S}_{|V^S}$ is a coherent $\mathscr{O}_{V^S}$-module for any finite ideal $S \subset W$ (where a subset $S \subset W$ is called an *ideal* if for $x \in S$ and $y \leq x \Rightarrow y \in S$), where V^S is the quasi-compact open subset of $\bar{X}$ defined by

$$V^S = \bigcup_{w \in S} wU^- B/B.$$

Let $K^0_T(\bar{X})$ denote the Grothendieck group of T-equivariant coherent $\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}$-modules $\mathcal{S}$.

Similarly, define $K_0^T(X) := \text{Limit}_{n\to\infty} K_0^T(X_n)$, where $\{X_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ is the filtration of X giving the ind-projective variety structure (i.e., $X_n = \bigcup_{\ell(w)\leq n} BwB/B$) and $K_0^T(X_n)$ is the Grothendieck group of T-equivariant coherent sheaves on the projective variety X_n.

We also define

$$K_T^{\text{top}}(X) := \text{Inv. lt.}_{n\to\infty} K_T^{\text{top}}(X_n),$$

where $K_T^{\text{top}}(X_n)$ is the T-equivariant topological K-group of the projective variety X_n.

Let $* : K_T^{\text{top}}(X_n) \to K_T^{\text{top}}(X_n)$ be the involution induced from the operation which takes a T-equivariant vector bundle to its dual. This, of course, induces the involution $*$ on $K_T^{\text{top}}(X)$.

Recall the 'basis' $\{\tau^w\}_{w\in W}$ of $K_T^{\text{top}}(X)$ given by Kostant-Kumar [KK, §3]. We consider a slight twist of this basis

$$\psi^w = *\tau^{w-1}.$$

For any $w \in W$

$$[\mathscr{O}_{X_w}] \in K_0^T(X).$$

3.2 Lemma. $\{[\mathscr{O}_{X_w}]\}_{w\in W}$ *forms a basis of* $K_0^T(X)$ *as an* $R(T)$*-module.*

Proof. By [CG, §5.2.14 and Theorem 5.4.17], the result follows. □

For $u \in W$, by [KS, §2], $\mathscr{O}_{X^u}$ is a coherent $\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}$-module. In particular, $\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}$ is a coherent $\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}$-module.

Consider the quasi-compact open subset $V^u := uU^-B/B \subset \bar{X}$. The following lemma is due to Kashiwara-Shimozono [KS, Lemma 8.1].

3.3 Lemma. *Any T-equivariant coherent sheaf $\mathcal{S}$ on V^u admits a free resolution in $Coh_T(\mathscr{O}_{V^u})$:*

$$0 \to S_n \otimes \mathscr{O}_{V^u} \to \cdots \to S_1 \otimes \mathscr{O}_{V^u} \to S_0 \otimes \mathscr{O}_{V^u} \to \mathcal{S} \to 0,$$

where S_k are finite dimensional T-modules and $Coh_T(\mathscr{O}_{V^u})$ denotes the abelian category of T-equivariant coherent $\mathscr{O}_{V^u}$-modules. □

Define a pairing

$$\langle\, ,\, \rangle : K^0_T(\bar{X}) \otimes K_0^T(X) \to R(T),\ \langle [\mathcal{S}], [\mathcal{F}] \rangle = \sum_i (-1)^i \chi_T(X_n, \mathscr{T}or_i^{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})),$$

if $\mathcal{S}$ is a T-equivariant coherent sheaf on $\bar{X}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is a T-equivariant coherent sheaf on X supported in X_n (for some n), where χ_T denotes the T-equivariant Euler-Poincaré characteristic.

3.4 Lemma. *The above pairing is well defined.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.3, for any $u \in W$, there exists $N(u)$ (depending upon $\mathcal{S}$) such that $\mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ for all $j > N(u)$ in the open set V^u. Now, let $j > \max_{\ell(u) \leq n} N(u)$, where $\mathcal{F}$ has support in X_n. Then,

$$\mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}) = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \bigcup_{\ell(u) \leq n} V^u$$

and hence $\mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ on $\bar{X}$, since $BuB/B \subset uB^-B/B$ and hence $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{F} \subset X_n \subset \cup_{\ell(u) \leq n} V^u$.

Of course, for any $j \geq 0$, $\mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})$ is a sheaf supported on X_n and it is $\mathcal{O}_{X_n}$-coherent on the open set $X_n \cap V^u$ of X_n for any $u \in W$. Thus, $\mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})$ is a $\mathcal{O}_{X_n}$-coherent sheaf and hence

$$\chi_T(\bar{X}, \mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})) = \chi_T(X_n, \mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}))$$

is well defined. This proves the lemma. □

By [KS, Proof of Proposition 3.4], for any $u \in W$,

$$\mathscr{E}xt^k_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u}, \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}) = 0 \quad \forall k \neq \ell(u). \tag{1}$$

Define the sheaf

$$\omega_{X^u} := \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u}, \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}) \otimes \mathcal{L}(-2\rho),$$

which, by the analogy with the Cohen-Macaulay (for short CM) schemes of finite type, will be called the *dualizing sheaf* of X^u.

Now, set the T-equivariant sheaf on $\bar{X}$

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^u &:= e^{-\rho}\mathcal{L}(\rho)\omega_{X^u} \\ &= e^{-\rho}\mathcal{L}(-\rho)\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u}, \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.3, for any $v \in W$, $\mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap V^v}$ admits the resolution

$$0 \to \mathcal{F}_n \to \cdots \to \mathcal{F}_0 \to \mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap V^v} \to 0$$

by free $\mathcal{O}_{V^v}$-modules of finite rank. Thus, the sheaf $\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u}, \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}})$ restricted to V^v is given by the $\ell(u)$-th cohomology of the sheaf sequence

$$0 \leftarrow \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}) \leftarrow \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{F}_{n-1}, \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}) \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}) \leftarrow 0.$$

In particular, $\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u}, \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}})$ restricted to V^v is $\mathcal{O}_{V^v}$-coherent and hence so is ξ^u as an $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}$-module. Hence,

$$[\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u}, \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}})] \in K^0_T(\bar{X}).$$

3.5 Proposition. *For any $u, w \in W$,*

$$\langle [\xi^u], [\mathcal{O}_{X_w}] \rangle = \delta_{u,w}.$$

Proof. Let $P_i := B \cup Bs_iB$ be the minimal parabolic subgroup of $\bar{G}$ corresponding to a simple root α_i and let $\pi_i : \bar{X} \to \bar{X}_i$ be the projection, where $\bar{X}_i := G/P_i$. Since π_i is a locally trivial fibration with fiber $\mathbb{P}^1$, there exist maps

$$K_T^0(\bar{X}) \xrightarrow{\pi_{i!}} K_T^0(\bar{X}_i) \xrightarrow{\pi_i^*} K_T^0(\bar{X}),$$

where

$$\pi_{i!} = R\pi_{i*} = \pi_{i*} - R^1\pi_{i*}, \quad \text{see [CG, §§5.2.5, 5.2.13].}$$

Let D_i be the composite $\pi_i^* \circ \pi_{i!}$.

By [KS, §3],

$$\begin{aligned} D_i[\mathscr{O}_{X^u}] &= [\mathscr{O}_{X^{us_i}}], && \text{if } us_i < u \\ &= [\mathscr{O}_{X^u}], && \text{if } us_i > u. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

We next prove that for s_i such that $ws_i < w$,

$$\langle [\xi^u], [\mathscr{O}_{X_w}] \rangle = \langle D_i[\xi^u], [\mathscr{O}_{X_{ws_i}}] \rangle. \tag{3}$$

Express

$$[\xi^u] = \pi_i^*(\xi_1^u) + H_i \cdot (\pi_i^* \xi_2^u), \tag{4}$$

where ξ_1^u and $\xi_2^u \in K_T^0(\bar{X}_i)$ and H_i is the line bundle on $\bar{X}$ which is of degree -1 along the fibers. This is possible by [CG, Theorem 5.2.31].

We first show that for s_i such that $ws_i < w$,

$$\langle [\xi^u], [\mathscr{O}_{X_w}] \rangle = \langle \pi_i^* \xi_1^u, [\mathscr{O}_{X_w}] \rangle. \tag{5}$$

Equivalently,

$$\langle H_i \cdot \pi_i^* \xi_2^u, [\mathscr{O}_{X_w}] \rangle = 0.$$

In this case $\pi_i : X_w \to \pi_i(X_w)$ is a $\mathbb{P}^1$-fibration. For any $v \in W$, let $V_i^v := vB^- P_i/P_i$ be the open subset of $\bar{X}_i$ and let $\hat{V}_i^v$ be the open subset $\pi_i^{-1}(V_i^v)$ of $\bar{X}$.

Assuming that ξ_2^u is represented by a coherent sheaf $\bar{\xi}_2^u$ on $\bar{X}_i$, i.e., $\xi_2^u = [\bar{\xi}_2^u]$, consider a free resolution on V_i^v:

$$0 \to \mathcal{F}_n \to \cdots \to \mathcal{F}_1 \to \mathcal{F}_0 \to \bar{\xi}_2^u \to 0.$$

Then,

$$0 \to \pi_i^*(\mathcal{F}_n) \to \cdots \to \pi_i^*(\mathcal{F}_1) \to \pi_i^*(\mathcal{F}_0) \to \pi_i^* \bar{\xi}_2^u \to 0 \tag{$*$}$$

is a free resolution of $\pi_i^*(\bar{\xi}_2^u) := \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}_i}} \bar{\xi}_2^u$ on $\hat{V}_i^v$. Then,

$$H_i \cdot \pi_i^* \xi_2^u = \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1)^j H_i \otimes \pi_i^*(\mathcal{F}_j) \qquad \text{in } K_T^0(\hat{V}_i^v), \text{ and}$$

$$\sum_j (-1)^j \mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathscr{O}_{\hat{V}_i^v}} (H_i \otimes \pi_i^* \bar{\xi}_2^u, \mathscr{O}_{X_w}) = \sum_j (-1)^j (H_i \otimes \pi_i^*(\mathcal{F}_j))_{|_{X_w \cap \hat{V}_i^v}}.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} H_i \cdot \pi_i^* \xi_2^u \otimes^\bullet [\mathscr{O}_{X_w}] := \sum_j (-1)^j \mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(H_i \otimes \pi_i^* \bar{\xi}_2^u, \mathscr{O}_{X_w}) \in K_T^{\mathrm{coh}}(X_w) \\ \xrightarrow{R\pi_{i*}} K_T^{\mathrm{coh}}(\pi_i X_w). \end{aligned}$$

By the above and the projection formula [H, Exercise 8.3, Chap. III], since H_i is of degree -1 along the fibers of π_i,

$$\begin{aligned} R\pi_{i*}\Big((H_i \cdot \pi_i^* \xi_2^u \otimes^\bullet [\mathscr{O}_{X_w}])_{|_{X_w \cap \hat{V}_i^v}}\Big) &= \sum_j (-1)^j (\mathscr{F}_j \otimes R\pi_{i*} H_i)_{|_{\pi_i X_w \cap V_i^v}} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

By an analogue of [KS, Equation 2.4],

$$K_T^{\mathrm{coh}}(\pi_i X_w) \hookrightarrow \prod_{v \in W} K_T^{\mathrm{coh}}(\pi_i X_w \cap V_i^v),$$

we get that

$$R\pi_{i*}(H_i \cdot \pi_i^* \xi_2^u \otimes^\bullet [\mathscr{O}_{X_w}]) = 0 \Rightarrow \langle H_i \cdot \pi_i^* \xi_2^u, [\mathscr{O}_{X_w}] \rangle = 0,$$

proving the claim (5) if $\xi_2^u = [\bar{\xi}_2^u]$. For general $\xi_2^u = [\bar{\xi}_2^u] - [\bar{\theta}_2^u]$, the proof of (5) reduces to the above case by considering it separately for $\bar{\xi}_2^u$ and $\bar{\theta}_2^u$.

Now, we claim that

$$D_i[\xi^u] = \pi_i^*(\xi_1^u). \tag{6}$$

Since, $K_T^0(\bar{X}) \hookrightarrow \prod_{v \in W} K_T^0(\widehat{V}_i^v)$ (cf. [KS, Equation 2.4]), it suffices to prove that

$$(D_i[\xi^u])_{|_{\widehat{V}_i^v}} = \pi_i^*(\xi_1^u)_{|_{\widehat{V}_i^v}}, \qquad \forall v \in W.$$

On $\widehat{V}_i^v$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned} D_i(H_i \cdot \pi_i^* \xi_2^u) &= D_i \sum_j (-1)^j H_i \otimes \pi_i^*(\mathscr{F}_j) \\ &= 0, \qquad \text{by the projection formula.} \end{aligned}$$

Further, on $\widehat{V}_i^v$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} D_i(\pi_i^* \xi_1^u) &= D_i \sum_j (-1)^j \pi_i^*(\mathscr{G}_j) \\ &= \sum_j (-1)^j \pi_i^*(\mathscr{G}_j), \qquad \text{by the projection formula} \\ &= \pi_i^* \xi_1^u, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$0 \to \mathcal{G}_n \to \cdots \to \mathcal{G}_0 \to \overline{\xi}_1^u \to 0$$

is a free resolution of $\overline{\xi}_1^u$ on V_i^v, where we assume $\xi_1^u = [\overline{\xi}_1^u]$. The general case of ξ_1^u clearly follows from this.

Thus the identity (6) is established.

So, for $ws_i < w$,

$$D_i[\xi^u] \otimes^\bullet [\mathscr{O}_{X_{ws_i}}] = \pi_i^* \xi_1^u \otimes^\bullet [\mathscr{O}_{X_{ws_i}}] \in K_T^{\mathrm{coh}}(X_w).$$

By the proof as above we see that, on $\pi_i(X_w) \cap V_i^v$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R\pi_{i*}(\pi_i^* \xi_1^u \otimes^\bullet [\mathscr{O}_{X_{ws_i}}]) &= R\pi_{i*}\Big(\sum_j (-1)^j (\pi_i^* \mathcal{G}_j)_{|_{X_{ws_i} \cap \widehat{V}_i^v}}\Big) \\ &= \sum_j (-1)^j \mathcal{G}_{j_{|_{\pi_i(X_w)}}}, \quad \text{by [K, Theorem 8.2.2]} \\ &= \xi_1^u \otimes^\bullet [\mathscr{O}_{\pi_i(X_w)}], \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

and similarly

$$R\pi_{i*}(\pi_i^* \xi_1^u \otimes^\bullet [\mathscr{O}_{X_w}]) = \xi_1^u \otimes^\bullet [\mathscr{O}_{\pi_i(X_w)}]. \tag{8}$$

Thus, combining the identities (5) - (8), we get (3).

Now, we come to the proof of the proposition by induction on $\ell(w)$. If $w = e$,

$$\langle [\xi^u], [\mathscr{O}_{X_e}] \rangle = \chi_T([\xi^u] \otimes^\bullet [\mathscr{O}_{X_e}]).$$

Take a free resolution on V^e

$$0 \to \mathcal{F}_n \to \cdots \to \mathcal{F}_0 \to \mathscr{O}_{X^u} \to 0.$$

Then, restricted to V^e, $\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}})$ is the $\ell(u)$-th cohomology of the following:

$$\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)-1}, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}) \to \mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)}, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}) \to \mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)+1}, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}).$$

Thus, by the identity (1),

$$(-1)^{\ell(u)} \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}) = \sum_j (-1)^j \mathcal{F}_j^* \qquad \text{on } V^e,$$

where $\mathcal{F}_j^* := \mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{F}_j, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}})$. This gives

$$[\xi^u] = (-1)^{\ell(u)} e^{-\rho} \mathcal{L}(-\rho) \sum_j (-1)^j \mathcal{F}_j^* \quad \text{on } V^e.$$

Thus,

$$\langle [\xi^u], [\mathscr{O}_{X_e}] \rangle = \delta_{e,u} \quad \text{by [KS, Identity 2.2]}.$$

We next show that

$$(9) \qquad \begin{aligned} D_i[\xi^u] &= [\xi^u] + [\xi^{us_i}], && \text{if } us_i < u \\ &= 0, && \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

By [KS, Corollary 3.3],

$$\begin{aligned} D_i[\mathcal{O}_{X^u}] &= [\mathcal{O}_{X^{us_i}}], && \text{if } us_i < u \\ &= [\mathcal{O}_{X^u}], && \text{if } us_i > u. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(10) \qquad [\mathcal{O}_{X^u}] \in \pi_i^* K_T^0(\overline{X}_i), \qquad \text{if } us_i > u$$

and

$$(11) \qquad [\mathcal{O}_{X^u}] = [\mathcal{O}_{X^{us_i}}] + H_i\Big((-[\mathcal{O}_{X^{us_i}}] + [\mathcal{O}_{X^u}]) \cdot H_i^*\Big), \text{ if } us_i < u,$$

where $[\mathcal{O}_{X^{us_i}}]$ and $([\mathcal{O}_{X^u}] - [\mathcal{O}_{X^{us_i}}]) \cdot H_i^* \in \pi_i^* K_T^0(\overline{X}_i)$.

Define

$$* : K_T^0(\overline{X}) \to K_T^0(\overline{X}) \text{ by } [\mathcal{F}] \mapsto \sum_i (-1)^i \mathcal{E}xt^i_{\mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}}),$$

for a T-equivariant coherent sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ on $\overline{X}$. It is well defined as can be easily seen by taking a finite locally free resolution of $\mathcal{F}$ on open subsets V^v.

Thus,

$$[\xi^u] = (-1)^{\ell(u)} e^{-\rho} \mathcal{L}(-\rho)(*[\mathcal{O}_{X^u}]).$$

It is easy to see that π_i^* commutes with $*$.

Case I. $us_i > u$:

In this case, by (10), $[\mathcal{O}_{X^u}] \in \pi_i^* K_T^0(\overline{X}_i)$ and hence so is $*[\mathcal{O}_{X^u}]$. Hence,

$$[\xi^u] = (-1)^{\ell(u)} e^{-\rho} \mathcal{L}(-\rho)(*[\mathcal{O}_{X^u}]) \in H_i \cdot \pi_i^* K_T^0(\overline{X}_i).$$

Thus,

$$D_i[\xi^u] = 0.$$

Case II. $us_i < u$:

In this case, by (11),

$$*[\mathcal{O}_{X^u}] = *[\mathcal{O}_{X^{us_i}}] + H_i^*\Big((- * [\mathcal{O}_{X^{us_i}}] + *[\mathcal{O}_{X^u}]) \cdot H_i\Big).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} [\xi^u] = (-1)^{\ell(u)} e^{-\rho} \mathcal{L}(-\rho)(*[\mathcal{O}_{X^u}]) &= (-1)^{\ell(u)} e^{-\rho} \mathcal{L}(-\rho)(*[\mathcal{O}_{X^{us_i}}]) \\ &+ (-1)^{\ell(u)} e^{-\rho} \mathcal{L}(-\rho) H_i^*\Big((- * [\mathcal{O}_{X^{us_i}}] + *[\mathcal{O}_{X^u}]) \cdot H_i\Big). \end{aligned}$$

The first term in the right side of the above equation belongs to $H_i \cdot \pi_i^* K_T^0(\overline{X}_i)$, whereas the second term belongs to $\pi_i^* K_T^0(\overline{X}_i)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} D_i[\xi^u] &= (-1)^{\ell(u)} e^{-\rho} \mathcal{L}(-\rho)(*[\mathcal{O}_{X^u}] - *[\mathcal{O}_{X^{us_i}}]) \\ &= [\xi^u] + [\xi^{us_i}]. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (9)

We finally prove the proposition. Take s_i such that $ws_i < w$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle [\xi^u], [\mathcal{O}_{X_w}] \rangle &= \langle D_i[\xi^u], [\mathcal{O}_{X_{ws_i}}] \rangle, \quad \text{by (3)} \\ &= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } us_i > u \\ \langle [\xi^u] + [\xi^{us_i}], [\mathcal{O}_{X_{ws_i}}] \rangle, & \text{if } us_i < u. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

If $us_i < u$, by induction,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle [\xi^u], [\mathcal{O}_{X_w}] \rangle = \langle [\xi^u] + [\xi^{us_i}], [\mathcal{O}_{X_{ws_i}}] \rangle &= \delta_{u,ws_i} + \delta_{us_i,ws_i} \\ &= \delta_{u,w} \qquad \text{since } u \neq ws_i. \end{aligned}$$

If $us_i > u$, since $w \neq u$ in this case,

$$\langle [\xi^u], [\mathcal{O}_{X_w}] \rangle = 0 = \delta_{u,w}.$$

Thus, we get

$$\langle [\xi^u], [\mathcal{O}_{X_w}] \rangle = \delta_{u,w},$$

completing the proof of the proposition. □

3.6 Remark. As pointed out by Kashiwara, in the case $us_i < u$, there is even a sheaf exact sequence:

$$0 \to \xi^{us_i} \to D_i \xi^u \to \xi^u \to 0.$$

4 Geometric identification of the T-equivariant K-theory structure constants and statements of the main results

Express the product in topological K-theory $K_T^{\text{top}}(X)$:

$$\psi^u \cdot \psi^v = \sum_w p_{u,v}^w \psi^w, \quad \text{for } p_{u,v}^w \in R(T).$$

Also, express the co-product in $K_0^T(X)$:

$$\Delta_*[\mathcal{O}_{X_w}] = \sum_{u,v} q_{u,v}^w [\mathcal{O}_{X_u}] \otimes [\mathcal{O}_{X_v}],$$

where $\Delta : X \to X \times X$ is the diagonal map.

4.1 Proposition. *For all* $u, v, w \in W$,

$$p^w_{u,v} = q^w_{u,v}.$$

Proof. For $w \in W$, fix a reduced decomposition $\mathfrak{w} = (s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_n})$ for w (i.e., $w = s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_n}$ is a reduced decomposition) and let $\theta : Z_\mathfrak{w} \to X_w$ be the Bott-Samelson-Demazure-Hansen (for short BSDH) desingularization (cf. [K, §7.1]). By [KK, Proposition 3.35], $K^0_T(Z_\mathfrak{w}) \to K^{\mathrm{top}}_T(Z_\mathfrak{w})$ is an isomorphism, where $K^0_T(Z_\mathfrak{w})$ is the Grothendieck group associated to the semigroup of T-equivariant algebraic vector bundles on $Z_\mathfrak{w}$. (Observe that the action of H on $Z_\mathfrak{w}$ descends to an action of T.) By [KK, Proposition 3.39] (where χ_T is the T-equivariant Euler-Poincaré characteristic),

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_T\Big(\theta^*(\psi^u\psi^v)\Big) &= \chi_T\bigg(\sum_{w_1} p^{w_1}_{u,v}\, \theta^*(\psi^{w_1})\bigg)\\ &= p^w_{u,v}.\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^*(\psi^u\psi^v) &= \theta^*\Delta^*(\psi^u \boxtimes \psi^v)\\ &= \Delta^*_\mathfrak{w}(\theta\times\theta)^*(\psi^u \boxtimes \psi^v)\\ &= \Delta^*_\mathfrak{w}(\theta^*\psi^u \boxtimes \theta^*\psi^v),\end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_\mathfrak{w} : Z_\mathfrak{w} \to Z_\mathfrak{w} \times Z_\mathfrak{w}$ is the diagonal map.

In the following proof, for any morphism f of schemes, we abbreviate Rf_* by $f_!$.

Let $\pi : Z_\mathfrak{w} \to pt$ and let $\Delta_{\mathfrak{w}*}[\mathscr{O}_{Z_\mathfrak{w}}] = \sum_{\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v}\le\mathfrak{w}} \hat{q}^\mathfrak{w}_{\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v}}[\mathscr{O}_{Z_\mathfrak{u}}] \boxtimes [\mathscr{O}_{Z_\mathfrak{v}}]$ for some unique $\hat{q}^\mathfrak{w}_{\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v}} \in R(T)$, where $\mathfrak{u} \le \mathfrak{w}$ means that $\mathfrak{u}$ is a subword of $\mathfrak{w}$. (This decomposition is due to the fact that $[\mathscr{O}_{Z_\mathfrak{u}}]_{\mathfrak{u}\le\mathfrak{w}}$ is an $R(T)$-basis of

$$K^T_0(Z_\mathfrak{w}) \simeq K^0_T(Z_\mathfrak{w}) \simeq K^{\mathrm{top}}_T(Z_\mathfrak{w}),$$

where $K^T_0(Z_\mathfrak{w})$ is the Grothendieck group associated to the semigroup of T-equivariant coherent sheaves on $Z_\mathfrak{w}$.) Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_T\Big(\theta^*(\psi^u\psi^v)\Big) &= \pi_!\Big(\Delta^*_\mathfrak{w}(\theta^*\psi^u \boxtimes \theta^*\psi^v)\Big)\\ &= (\pi\times\pi)_!\Big(\Delta_{\mathfrak{w}*}(\Delta^*_\mathfrak{w}(\theta^*\psi^u \boxtimes \theta^*\psi^v))\Big)\\ &= (\pi\times\pi)_!((\theta^*\psi^u \boxtimes \theta^*\psi^v)\cdot(\Delta_{\mathfrak{w}*}[\mathscr{O}_{Z_\mathfrak{w}}])), \quad \text{by the projection formula}\\ &= (\pi\times\pi)_!\Big((\theta^*\psi^u \boxtimes \theta^*\psi^v)\cdot(\sum_{\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v}} \hat{q}^\mathfrak{w}_{\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v}}[\mathscr{O}_{Z_\mathfrak{u}}] \boxtimes [\mathscr{O}_{Z_\mathfrak{v}}])\Big)\\ &= \sum_{\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v}} \hat{q}^\mathfrak{w}_{\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v}}\chi_T(\theta^*\psi^u\cdot[\mathscr{O}_{Z_\mathfrak{u}}])\chi_T(\theta^*\psi^v\cdot[\mathscr{O}_{Z_\mathfrak{v}}])\\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mu(\mathfrak{u})=u\\ \mu(\mathfrak{v})=v}} \hat{q}^\mathfrak{w}_{\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v}},\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

where the last equality follows since

$$\chi_T(\theta^*\psi^u\cdot[\mathscr{O}_{Z_\mathfrak{u}}]) = \delta_{u,\mu(\mathfrak{u})},\tag{14}$$

where $\mu(\mathfrak{u})$ denotes the Weyl group element u if the standard map $Z_{\mathfrak{u}} \to G/B$ has image precisely equal to X_u. To prove the above identity (14), use [KK, Propositions 3.36, 3.39], and the proof of [K, Corollary 8.1.10]. (Actually, we need the extension of [KK, Proposition 3.36] for non-reduced words $\mathfrak{v}$, but the proof of this extension is identical.)

From the identity

$$\Delta_{\mathfrak{w}*}[\mathscr{O}_{Z_{\mathfrak{w}}}] = \sum_{\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v}\leq\mathfrak{w}} \hat{q}^{\mathfrak{w}}_{\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v}}[\mathscr{O}_{Z_{\mathfrak{u}}}] \boxtimes \mathscr{O}_{Z_{\mathfrak{v}}}],$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_*\theta_![\mathscr{O}_{Z_{\mathfrak{w}}}] &= (\theta\times\theta)_!\,\Delta_{\mathfrak{w}*}[\mathscr{O}_{Z_{\mathfrak{w}}}]\\ &= \sum_{\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v}} \hat{q}^{\mathfrak{w}}_{\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v}}\theta_![\mathscr{O}_{Z_{\mathfrak{u}}}] \boxtimes \theta_![\mathscr{O}_{Z_{\mathfrak{v}}}]\\ &= \sum_{u_1,v_1\leq w}\ \sum_{\substack{\mu(\mathfrak{u})=u_1\\ \mu(\mathfrak{v})=v_1}} \hat{q}^{\mathfrak{w}}_{\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v}}[\mathscr{O}_{X_{u_1}}] \boxtimes [\mathscr{O}_{X_{v_1}}],\end{aligned}\tag{15}$$

by [K, Theorem 8.2.2(c)]. Moreover, since

$$\Delta_*\,\theta_![\mathscr{O}_{Z_{\mathfrak{w}}}] = \Delta_*\,[\mathscr{O}_{X_w}] = \sum q^{w}_{u_1,v_1}[\mathscr{O}_{X_{u_1}}] \boxtimes [\mathscr{O}_{X_{v_1}}],\tag{16}$$

we get (equating (15) and (16)) for any $u_1, v_1 \leq w$:

$$q^{w}_{u_1,v_1} = \sum_{\substack{\mu(\mathfrak{u})=u_1\\ \mu(\mathfrak{v})=v_1}} \hat{q}^{\mathfrak{w}}_{\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{v}}.\tag{17}$$

Combining (12), (13) and (17), we get $p^w_{u,v} = q^w_{u,v}$. This proves the proposition. □

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the $R(T)$-span of $\{[\xi^u]\}_{u\in W}$ inside $K^0_T(\overline{X})$ (where we allow infinite sums), and let $\mathcal{S}^\perp := \{a \in K^0_T(\overline{X}) : \langle a, [\mathscr{O}_{X_w}]\rangle = 0, \text{ for all } w \in W\}$. Then, by Proposition 3.5,

$$K^0_T(\overline{X}) = \mathcal{S} \oplus \mathcal{S}^\perp,$$

and $\{[\xi^u]\}_{u\in W}$ are independent over $R(T)$. Now, express the product in $K^0_T(\overline{X})$:

$$[\xi^u]\cdot[\xi^v] = a + \sum_{w} d^w_{u,v}[\xi^w], \quad \text{for } q^w_{u,v} \in R(T), \text{ and } a \in \mathcal{S}^\perp.$$

Let $\overline{\Delta} : \overline{X} \to \overline{X} \times \overline{X}$ be the diagonal map. Then,

$$[\xi^u]\cdot[\xi^v] = \overline{\Delta}^*([\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v]).$$

4.2 Lemma. *For all $u, v, w \in W$,*

$$p^w_{u,v} = d^w_{u,v}.$$

Proof. For any $w \in W$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \bar{\Delta}^*([\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v]), [\mathcal{O}_{X_w}]\rangle &= \langle [\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v], \bar{\Delta}_*[\mathcal{O}_{X_w}]\rangle \\ &= \langle [\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v], \sum_{u',v'} p^w_{u',v'}[\mathcal{O}_{X_{u'}}] \otimes [\mathcal{O}_{X_{v'}}]\rangle, \text{ by Proposition 4.1} \\ &= p^w_{u,v}, \text{ by Proposition 3.5.}\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \bar{\Delta}^*([\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v]), [\mathcal{O}_{X_w}]\rangle &= \langle [\xi^u] \cdot [\xi^v], [\mathcal{O}_{X_w}]\rangle \\ &= d^w_{u,v}, \text{ by Proposition 3.5 again.}\end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. ☐

4.3 Remark. (Due to M. Kashiwara) In fact,

$$K^0_T(\bar{X}) = \mathcal{S},$$

i.e., $\mathcal{S}^\perp = 0$. To prove this, write $[\xi^u]$ as a linear combination of $[\mathcal{O}_{X^v}]$. Then, it is an upper triangular matrix with invertible diagonal terms.

Fix a large N and let

$$\mathbb{P} = (\mathbb{P}^N)^r \qquad (r = \dim T).$$

For any $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_r) \in [N]^r$, where $[N] = \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$, set

$$\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{j}} = \mathbb{P}^{N-j_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{P}^{N-j_r}.$$

We fix an identification $T \simeq (\mathbb{C}^*)^r$ throughout the paper satisfying the condition that for any positive root α, the character e^α (under the identification) is given by $z_1^{d_1(\alpha)} \dots z_r^{d_r(\alpha)}$ for some $d_i(\alpha) \geq 0$, where $(z_1, \dots, z_r)$ are the standard coordinates on $(\mathbb{C}^*)^r$. One such identification $T \simeq (\mathbb{C}^*)^r$ is given by $t \mapsto (e^{\alpha_1}(t), \dots, e^{\alpha_r}(t))$. *This will be our default choice.*

Let $E(T)_\mathbb{P} := (\mathbb{C}^{N+1} \setminus \{0\})^r$ be the total space of the standard principal T-bundle $E(T)_\mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{P}$. We can view $E(T)_\mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{P}$ as a finite dimensional approximation of the classifying bundle for T. Let $\pi : \tilde{X} := E(T)_\mathbb{P} \times^T X \to \mathbb{P}$ be the fibration with fiber $X = G/B$ associated to the principal T-bundle $E(T)_\mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{P}$, where we twist the standard action of T on X via

$$t \odot x = t^{-1}x. \tag{18}$$

For any T-subscheme $Y \subset X$, we denote $\tilde{Y} := E(T)_\mathbb{P} \times^T Y \subset \tilde{X}$.

The following theorem follows easily by using [CG, §5.2.14] together with [CG, Theorem 5.4.17] applied to the vector bundles $\widetilde{BwB/B} \to \mathbb{P}$.

4.4 Theorem. $K_0(\tilde{X}) := \text{Limit}_{n\to\infty} K_0(\tilde{X}_n)$ *is a free module over the ring* $K_0(\mathbb{P}) = K^0(\mathbb{P})$ *with basis* $\{[\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_w}]\}_{w\in W}$, *where* K_0 *(resp.* K^0*) denotes the Grothendieck group associated to the semigroup of coherent sheaves (resp. locally free sheaves).*

Thus, $K_0(\tilde{X})$ *has a* $\mathbb{Z}$*-basis*

$$\{\pi^*([\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{j}}}]) \cdot [\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_w}]\}_{\mathbf{j}\in[N]^r, w\in W},$$

where we view $[\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{j}}}]$ *as an element of* $K_0(\mathbb{P}) = K^0(\mathbb{P})$. ☐

Let $Y := X \times X$. The diagonal map $\Delta : X \to Y$ gives rise to the embedding

$$\tilde{\Delta} : \tilde{X} \to \tilde{Y} = E(T)_{\mathbb{P}} \times^T Y \simeq \tilde{X} \times_{\mathbb{P}} \tilde{X}.$$

Thus, we get

$$\tilde{\Delta}_*[\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{X}_w}] = \sum_{\substack{u,v \in W \\ \mathbf{j} \in [N]^r}} c^w_{u,v}(\mathbf{j}) \pi^*([\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{j}}}]) \cdot [\mathscr{O}_{\widetilde{X_u \times X_v}}] \in K_0(\tilde{Y}), \tag{19}$$

for $c^w_{u,v}(\mathbf{j}) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}} = \mathbb{P}^{j_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_r},$$
$$\partial \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}} = (\mathbb{P}^{j_1 - 1} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_r}) \cup \cdots \cup (\mathbb{P}^{j_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{P}^{j_{r-1}} \times \mathbb{P}^{j_r - 1}),$$

where we interpret $\mathbb{P}^{-1} = \emptyset$. It is easy to see that, under the standard pairing on $K^0(\mathbb{P})$,

$$\langle [\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{j}}}], [\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}'}}(-\partial \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}'})] \rangle = \delta_{\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}'}. \tag{20}$$

Alternatively, it is a special case of [GK, Proposition 2.1].

Let $\overline{Y} = \overline{X} \times \overline{X}$ and $K^0(\tilde{\overline{Y}})$ denote the Grothendieck group associated to the semigroup of coherent $\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\overline{Y}}}$-modules $\mathcal{S}$, i.e., those $\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\overline{Y}}}$-modules $\mathcal{S}$ such that $\mathcal{S}_{|\widetilde{V^{S_1} \times V^{S_2}}}$ is a coherent $\mathscr{O}_{\widetilde{V^{S_1} \times V^{S_2}}}$-module for all finite ideals $S_1, S_2 \subset W$. Also, let $\hat{\mathcal{L}}(\rho \boxtimes \rho)$ be the line bundle on $\tilde{\overline{Y}}$ defined as

$$E(T)_{\mathbb{P}} \times^T e^{-2\rho}(\mathcal{L}(-\rho) \boxtimes \mathcal{L}(-\rho)) \to \tilde{\overline{Y}},$$

where the action of T on the line bundle $e^{-2\rho}(\mathcal{L}(-\rho) \boxtimes \mathcal{L}(-\rho))$ over $\overline{Y}$ is also twisted the same way as in (18).

4.5 Lemma. *With the notation as above,*

$$c^w_{u,v}(\mathbf{j}) = \left\langle \pi^*[\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}})] \cdot [\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v}], \tilde{\Delta}_*[\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{X}_w}] \right\rangle,$$

where the coherent sheaf $\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v}$ on $\tilde{\overline{Y}}$ is defined as:

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}(\rho \boxtimes \rho) \otimes \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)+\ell(v)}_{\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\overline{Y}}}}(\mathscr{O}_{\widetilde{X^u \times X^v}}, \mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\overline{Y}}}),$$

and the pairing

$$\langle \, , \, \rangle : K^0(\tilde{\overline{Y}}) \otimes K_0(\tilde{Y}) \to \mathbb{Z}$$

is similar to the pairing defined earlier. Specifically,

$$\langle [\mathcal{S}], [\mathcal{F}] \rangle = \sum_i (-1)^i \chi(\tilde{\overline{Y}}, \mathscr{T}or_i^{\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\overline{Y}}}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})),$$

where χ is the Euler-Poincaré characteristic.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\langle \pi^*[\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}})]\cdot[\widetilde{\xi^u\boxtimes\xi^v}],\tilde{\Delta}_*[\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{X}_w}]\Big\rangle & \\ &= \Big\langle \pi^*[\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}})]\cdot[\widetilde{\xi^u\boxtimes\xi^v}], \sum_{\substack{u',v'\in W,\\ \mathbf{j}'\in[N]^r}} c^w_{u',v'}(\mathbf{j}')\,\pi^*([\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}\mathbf{j}'}])[\mathscr{O}_{\widetilde{X_{u'}\times X_{v'}}}]\Big\rangle\\ &= c^w_{u,v}(\mathbf{j}),\quad \text{by Proposition 3.5 and the identity (20).}\end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. □

4.6 Definition (Mixing group)**.** Let T act on B via the inverse conjugation, i.e.,

$$t\cdot b = t^{-1}bt,\quad t\in T, b\in B.$$

Consider the ind-group scheme (over $\mathbb{P}$):

$$\tilde{B} = E(T)_{\mathbb{P}}\times^T B\to\mathbb{P}.$$

Note that $\tilde{B}$ is not a principal B-bundle since there is no right action of B on $\tilde{B}$. Let Γ_0 be the group of global sections of the bundle $\tilde{B}$ under the pointwise multiplication. Since $GL(N+1)^r$ acts canonically on $\tilde{B}$ compatible with $\mathbb{P} = (\mathbb{P}^N)^r$, it also acts on Γ_0 via the pull-back. Let Γ_B be the semi-direct product $\Gamma_0 \ltimes GL(N+1)^r$:

$$1\to\Gamma_0\to\Gamma_B\to GL(N+1)^r\to 1.$$

Then, Γ_B acts on $\tilde{X}$ with orbits precisely equal to $\{\widetilde{BwB/B}\}_{w\in W}$, where the action of the subgroup Γ_0 is via the standard action of B on X. This follows from the following lemma.

4.7 Lemma. *For any $\overline{e}\in\mathbb{P}$ and any b in the fiber of $\tilde{B}$ over $\overline{e}$, there exists a section $\gamma\in\Gamma_0$ such that $\gamma(\overline{e}) = b$.*

Proof. For a character λ of T, let $\mathscr{O}(\lambda)$ be the line bundle on $\mathbb{P}$ associated to the principal T-bundle $E(T)_{\mathbb{P}}\to\mathbb{P}$ via the character λ of T. For any positive real root α, let $U_\alpha\subset U$ be the corresponding one parameter subgroup (cf. [K, §6.1.5(a)]), where U is the unipotent radical of B. Then, $\tilde{B}$ contains the subbundle $H\times\mathscr{O}(-\alpha)$. By the assumption on the identification $T\simeq(\mathbb{C}^*)^r$, for any positive root α, $\mathscr{O}(-\alpha)$ is globally generated. Thus, $\Gamma_0(\overline{e})\supset H\times U_\alpha$. Since Γ_0 is a group and the group U is generated by the subgroups $\{U_\alpha\}$, where α runs over the positive real roots, we get the lemma. □

4.8 Lemma. Γ_B *is connected.*

Proof. It suffices to show that Γ_0 is connected. But, $\Gamma_0\simeq H\times\Gamma(E(T)_{\mathbb{P}}\times^T U)$, where $\Gamma(E(T)_{\mathbb{P}}\times^T U)$ denotes the group of sections of the bundle $E(T)_{\mathbb{P}}\times^T U\to\mathbb{P}$. Thus, it suffices to show that $\Gamma(E(T)_{\mathbb{P}}\times^T U)$ is connected. Using the contraction of U (in the analytic topology) given in [K, Proposition 7.4.17], it is easy to see that $\Gamma(E(T)_{\mathbb{P}}\times^T U)$ is contractible. In particular, it is connected. □

Similarly, we define $\Gamma_{B\times B}$ by replacing B by $B \times B$ and T by the diagonal $\Delta T \subset T \times T$ and we abbreviate it by Γ.

4.9 Proposition. *For any coherent sheaf $\mathcal{S}$ on $\mathbb{P}$, and any $u, v \in W$,*

$$\pi^*[\mathcal{S}] \cdot [\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v}] = [\pi^*(\mathcal{S}) \underset{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}}}{\otimes} (\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v})] \in K^0(\tilde{\tilde{Y}}),$$

where $\pi^*(\mathcal{S}) := \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}} \underset{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}}{\otimes} \mathcal{S}$.

In particular,

$$\pi^*[\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}})] \cdot [\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v}] = \left[\pi^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}})) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}}} (\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v})\right].$$

Proof. By definition,

$$\pi^*[\mathcal{S}] \cdot [\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v}] = \sum_{i\geq 0} (-1)^i [\mathcal{T}or_i^{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}}}(\pi^*(\mathcal{S}), \widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v})].$$

Thus, it suffices to prove that

$$\mathcal{T}or_i^{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}}}(\pi^*\mathcal{S}, \widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v}) = 0, \ \forall i > 0.$$

Since the question is local in the base, we can assume that $\tilde{\tilde{Y}} \cong \mathbb{P} \times \bar{Y}$. Observe that, locally on the base,

$$\pi^*\mathcal{S} \simeq \mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathcal{O}_{\bar{Y}} \quad \text{and}$$
$$\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}} \boxtimes (\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v),$$

where $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathcal{O}_{\bar{Y}}$ means $\mathcal{S} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{O}_{\bar{Y}}$ etc. Now, the result follows since, for algebras R and S over a field k and R-module M, S-module N,

$$\mathrm{Tor}_i^{R\boxtimes S}(M \boxtimes S, R \boxtimes N) = 0, \quad \text{for all } i > 0.$$

□

The following is our main technical result. The proof of its two parts are given in Sections 5 and 9 respectively.

4.10 Theorem. *For general $\gamma \in \Gamma = \Gamma_{B\times B}$, any $u, v, w \in W$, and $\mathbf{j} \in [N]^r$,*

(a)
$$\mathcal{T}or_i^{\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}}}(\pi^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}})) \otimes (\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v}), \gamma_*\tilde{\Delta}_*\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_w}) = 0, \ \ \textit{for all } i > 0,$$

where we view any element $\gamma \in \Gamma$ as an automorphism of the scheme $\tilde{\tilde{Y}}$.

(b)
$$H^p(\tilde{\tilde{Y}}, \pi^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}})) \otimes (\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v}) \otimes \gamma_*\tilde{\Delta}_*\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_w}) = 0$$

for all $p \neq |\mathbf{j}| + \ell(w) - (\ell(u) + \ell(v))$, where $|\mathbf{j}| := \sum_{i=1}^r j_i$.

Since Γ is connected, we get the following result as an immediate corollary of Lemma 4.5 and Theorem 4.10.

4.11 Corollary.

$$(-1)^{\ell(w)-\ell(u)-\ell(v)+|\mathbf{j}|}c^w_{u,v}(\mathbf{j}) \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

Recall the definition of the structure constants $p^w_{u,v} \in R(T)$ for the product in $K^{\text{top}}_T(X)$ from the beginning of this section. The following lemma follows easily from [GK, Lemma 6.2] (also see [AGM, §3]).

4.12 Lemma. *For any $u, v, w \in W$, we can choose large enough N (depending upon u, v, w) and express (by [GK, Theorem 5.1])*

$$p^w_{u,v} = \sum_{\mathbf{j}\in[N]^r} p^w_{u,v}(\mathbf{j})(e^{-\alpha_1} - 1)^{j_1} \dots (e^{-\alpha_r} - 1)^{j_r}, \tag{21}$$

for some unique $p^w_{u,v}(\mathbf{j}) \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_r)$. Then,

$$p^w_{u,v}(\mathbf{j}) = (-1)^{|\mathbf{j}|}c^w_{u,v}(\mathbf{j}). \tag{22}$$

As an immediate consequence of Corollary 4.11 and Lemma 4.12, we get the following main theorem of this paper, which generalizes one of the main results of Anderson-Griffeth-Miller [AGM, Corollary 5.2] (which was conjectured earlier by Graham-Kumar [GK, Conjecture 3.1]) from the finite to any symmetrizable Kac-Moody case.

4.13 Theorem. *For any $u, v, w \in W$, and any symmetrizable Kac-Moody group G, the structure constants in $K^{\text{top}}_T(X)$ satisfy:*

$$(-1)^{\ell(u)+\ell(v)+\ell(w)}\, p^w_{u,v} \in \mathbb{Z}_+[(e^{-\alpha_1} - 1), \dots, (e^{-\alpha_r} - 1)]. \tag{23}$$

□

Recall that

$$K^{\text{top}}(X) \simeq \mathbb{Z} \otimes_{R(T)} K^{\text{top}}_T(X) \tag{24}$$

(cf. [KK, Proposition 3.25]), where $\mathbb{Z}$ is considered as an $R(T)$-module via the evaluation at 1. Express the product in $K^{\text{top}}(X)$ in the basis $\{\psi^u_o := 1 \otimes \psi^u\}_{u\in W}$:

$$\psi^u_o \cdot \psi^v_o = \sum_w a^w_{u,v}\psi^w_o, \quad \text{for } a^w_{u,v} \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Then, by the isomorphism (24),

$$a^w_{u,v} = p^w_{u,v}(1).$$

Thus, from Theorem 4.13, we immediately obtain the following result which generalizes one of the main results of Brion [B] (conjectured by A.S. Buch) from the finite to any symmetrizable Kac-Moody case.

4.14 Corollary. *For any $u, v, w \in W$,*

$$(-1)^{\ell(u)+\ell(v)+\ell(w)}\, a^w_{u,v} \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

4.15 Remark. (a) Even though we have proved the above results for the full flag variety X, their extension to an arbitrary partial flag variety $G^{\min}/P$ is easy.

(b) It is quite possible that the analogue of Theorem 4.10 and hence that of Theorem 4.13 is true (by a similar proof) for the basis ξ^u replaced by the structure sheaf basis $\{\phi^u = [\mathscr{O}_{X^u}]\}_{u\in W}$. Then, the analogue of Corollary 4.14 for the basis $\{\phi^u_o\}$ was conjectured by Lam-Schilling-Shimozono [LSS, Conjectures 7.20 (2) and 7.21 (3)] for the infinite Grassmannian associated to SL_N.

5 Study of some $\mathscr{E}xt$ and $\mathscr{T}or$ functors and proof of Theorem 4.10 (a)

5.1 Proposition. *For any $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $u, w \in W$, as T-equivariant sheaves,*

$$\mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\xi^u, \mathscr{O}_{X_w}) \simeq e^{-\rho}\mathcal{L}(-\rho) \underset{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}{\otimes} \left(\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)-j}_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{X_w})\right).$$

In particular, $\mathscr{E}xt^j_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{X_w}) = 0$, for all $j > \ell(u)$.

Proof. By definition,

$$\xi^u = e^{-\rho}\mathcal{L}(-\rho)\, \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}).$$

By Lemma 3.3, $\mathscr{O}_{X^u\cap V^v}$ admits a T-equivariant resolution (for any $v \in W$):

$$0 \to \mathcal{F}_n \xrightarrow{\delta_{n-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\delta_0} \mathcal{F}_0 \to \mathscr{O}_{X^u\cap V^v} \to 0 \tag{25}$$

by T-equivariant free $\mathscr{O}_{V^v}$-modules of finite rank.

Since $\mathcal{M}_j := \mathscr{E}xt^j_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}) = 0$ for all $j \neq \ell(u)$ (cf. the identity (1)), the dual complex

$$0 \leftarrow \mathcal{F}^*_n \xleftarrow{\delta^*_{n-1}} \mathcal{F}^*_{n-1} \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow \mathcal{F}^*_{\ell(u)} \leftarrow \cdots \xleftarrow{\delta^*_0} \mathcal{F}^*_0 \leftarrow 0 \tag{26}$$

gives rise to the resolution

$$0 \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\ell(u)} := \frac{\operatorname{Ker}\delta^*_{\ell(u)}}{\operatorname{Image}\delta^*_{\ell(u)-1}} \leftarrow \operatorname{Ker}\delta^*_{\ell(u)} \leftarrow \mathcal{F}^*_{\ell(u)-1} \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow \mathcal{F}^*_0 \leftarrow 0,$$

where $\mathcal{F}^*_i := \mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{F}_i, \mathscr{O}_{V^v})$.

We next claim that $\operatorname{Ker}\delta^*_j$ is a $\mathscr{O}_{V^v}$-module direct summand of $\mathcal{F}^*_j$ for all $j \geq \ell(u)$:

We prove this by downward induction on j. Since (26) has cohomology only in degree $\ell(u)$, if $n > \ell(u)$, $\operatorname{Image}\delta^*_{n-1} = \mathcal{F}^*_n$ and hence $\operatorname{Ker}\delta^*_{n-1}$ is a direct summand $\mathscr{O}_{V^v}$-submodule of $\mathcal{F}^*_{n-1}$. Thus, $\operatorname{Ker}\delta^*_{n-2}$ is a direct summand of $\mathcal{F}^*_{n-2}$ if $n-2 \geq \ell(u)$. Continuing this way, we see that $\operatorname{Ker}\delta^*_{\ell(u)}$ is a direct summand $\mathscr{O}_{V^v}$-submodule of $\mathcal{F}^*_{\ell(u)}$.

Thus, we get a projective resolution:

$$0 \to \mathcal{P}_{\ell(u)} \to \cdots \to \mathcal{P}_1 \to \mathcal{P}_0 \to \mathcal{M}_{\ell(u)} \to 0,$$

where $\mathcal{P}_0 := \operatorname{Ker} \delta^*_{\ell(u)}$, $\mathcal{P}_i := \mathcal{F}^*_{\ell(u)-i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \ell(u)$. Hence, restricted to the open subset V^v, $\mathscr{T}or_*^{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\xi^u, \mathscr{O}_{X_w})$ is the homology of the complex

$$0 \to (e^{-\rho}\mathcal{L}(-\rho)\mathcal{P}_{\ell(u)}) \underset{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}{\otimes} \mathscr{O}_{X_w} \to \cdots \to (e^{-\rho}\mathcal{L}(-\rho)\mathcal{P}_0) \underset{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}{\otimes} \mathscr{O}_{X_w} \to 0.$$

Now, we show that the j-th homology of the complex

$$C: \qquad 0 \to \mathcal{P}_{\ell(u)} \underset{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}{\otimes} \mathscr{O}_{X_w} \to \cdots \to \mathcal{P}_0 \underset{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}{\otimes} \mathscr{O}_{X_w} \to 0$$

is isomorphic with $\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)-j}_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{X_w})$:

Since

$$\mathcal{P}_i \underset{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}{\otimes} \mathscr{O}_{X_w} \simeq \mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)-i}, \mathscr{O}_{X_w}), \quad \text{for all } i \geq 1,$$

we get

$$\mathscr{H}_j(C) \simeq \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)-j}_{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{X_w}), \qquad \text{for all } j \geq 2. \tag{27}$$

Moreover, since $\mathcal{P}_0$ is a direct summand of $\mathcal{F}^*_{\ell(u)}$, we get

$$\mathscr{H}_1(C) \simeq \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)-1}_{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{X_w}). \tag{28}$$

Now,

$$\mathscr{H}_0(C) = \frac{\mathcal{P}_0 \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}} \mathscr{O}_{X_w}}{\operatorname{Image}(\mathcal{P}_1 \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}} \mathscr{O}_{X_w})} \simeq \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{X_w}), \tag{29}$$

since $\operatorname{Ker} \delta^*_{\ell(u)}$ is a direct summand of $\mathcal{F}^*_{\ell(u)}$ and $\operatorname{Ker} \delta^*_{\ell(u)+1} = \operatorname{Image} \delta^*_{\ell(u)}$ is a direct summand of $\mathcal{F}^*_{\ell(u)+1}$.

Finally,

$$\mathscr{E}xt^{j}_{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{X_w}) = 0, \qquad \text{for all } j > \ell(u). \tag{30}$$

To prove this, observe that, for $j > \ell(u)$,

$$0 \to \operatorname{Ker} \delta^*_j \to \mathcal{F}^*_j \xrightarrow{\delta^*_j} \operatorname{Image} \delta^*_j = \operatorname{Ker} \delta^*_{j+1} \to 0$$

is a split exact sequence since $\operatorname{Ker} \delta^*_{j+1}$ is projective. Thus,

$$0 \to \operatorname{Ker} \delta^*_j \underset{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}{\otimes} \mathscr{O}_{X_w} \to \mathcal{F}^*_j \underset{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}{\otimes} \mathscr{O}_{X_w} \to (\operatorname{Image} \delta^*_j) \underset{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}{\otimes} \mathscr{O}_{X_w} \to 0$$

is exact. Moreover, $\operatorname{Image} \delta^*_j \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}^*_{j+1}$ is a direct summand and hence

$$\operatorname{Image} \delta^*_j \underset{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}{\otimes} \mathscr{O}_{X_w} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}^*_{j+1} \underset{\mathscr{O}_{V^v}}{\otimes} \mathscr{O}_{X_w}.$$

From this (30) follows (since $\operatorname{Image} \delta^*_{j-1} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}^*_j$ is a direct summand).

Combining (27) – (30), we get the proposition. □

The following is a minor generalization of the ‘acyclicity lemma’ of Peskine-Szpiro [PS, Lemme 1.8].

5.2 Lemma. *Let R be a local noetherian CM domain and let*

$$(*) \qquad 0 \to F_n \to F_{n-1} \to \cdots \to F_0 \to 0$$

be a complex of finitely-generated free R-modules. Fix a positive integer $d > 0$. *Assume:*

(a) some irreducible component Z of the support of $M := \oplus_{i\geq 1} H_i(F_*)$ *has codimension* $\geq d$ *in Spec R, and*

$$\text{(b)} \qquad F_i = 0, \quad \textit{for all } i > d.$$

Then,

$$H_i(F_*) = 0, \quad \textit{for all } i > 0.$$

Proof. Assume, if possible, that $M \neq 0$. Let $I \subset R$ be the annihilator of M and let $\mathfrak{p}$ be the (minimal) prime ideal containing I corresponding to Z. Then,

$$(31) \qquad M \otimes_R R_{\mathfrak{p}} \neq 0,$$

and

$$(32) \qquad \operatorname{depth}(M \otimes_R R_{\mathfrak{p}}) = 0.$$

Next observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{depth}(F_* \otimes_R R_{\mathfrak{p}}) &= \operatorname{depth} R_{\mathfrak{p}} \\ &:= \operatorname{depth}_{\mathfrak{p}} R_{\mathfrak{p}} \\ &= \operatorname{codim}(\mathfrak{p} R_{\mathfrak{p}}), \quad \text{since } R_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{ is CM} \\ &= \operatorname{codim}(\mathfrak{p}) \\ &\geq d. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by applying the acyclicity lemma of Peskine-Szpiro [PS, Lemme 1.8] to the complex $F_* \otimes_R R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and using the identities (31),(32), we get a contradiction.

Thus, $M = 0$, proving the lemma. □

5.3 Corollary. *Let Y be an irreducible CM variety and* $d > 0$ *a positive integer. Let*

$$0 \leftarrow \mathcal{G}^n \xleftarrow{\delta^{n-1}} \mathcal{G}^{n-1} \leftarrow \cdots \xleftarrow{\delta^0} \mathcal{G}^0 \leftarrow 0$$

be a complex of locally free $\mathcal{O}_Y$*-modules of finite rank satisfying the following:*

1) The support of the sheaf $\oplus_{i<d} \mathcal{H}^i(\mathcal{G}^*)$ *has an irreducible component of codimension* $\geq d$ *in* Y.

2) The sheaf $\mathcal{H}^j(\mathcal{G}^*) = 0$, *for all* $j > d$.

Then, $\mathcal{H}^j(\mathcal{G}^*) = 0$ *for all* $j < d$ *as well.*

Proof. We first claim by downward induction that $\operatorname{Ker}\delta^j$ is a direct summand of $\mathcal{G}^j$, for any $j \geq d$. The proof is similar to that given in the proof of Proposition 5.1. Thus,

$$H^*(\mathcal{G}^*) \simeq H^*(\mathcal{F}^*),$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}^i = \mathcal{G}^i \text{ for all } i < d,\ \mathcal{F}^d = \operatorname{Ker}\delta^d,\ \text{ and } \mathcal{F}^i = 0 \text{ for } i > d.$$

Thus, we can assume that $\mathcal{G}^i = 0$, for all $i > d$. Now, we apply the last lemma to get the result. □

5.4 Proposition. *For any* $u, w \in W$*,*

$$\mathscr{E}xt^j_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w}) = 0, \qquad \textit{for all } j < \ell(u).$$

Thus,

$$\mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\xi^u, \mathcal{O}_{X_w}) = 0, \quad \textit{for all } j > 0.$$

Proof. We can, of course, replace $\bar{X}$ by V^v (for $v \in W$). Consider a locally $\mathcal{O}_{V^v}$-free resolution of finite rank:

$$0 \to \mathcal{F}_n \to \mathcal{F}_{n-1} \to \cdots \to \mathcal{F}_0 \to \mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap V^v} \to 0.$$

Then, restricted to the open set V^v, $\mathscr{E}xt^j_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w})$ is the j-th cohomology of the complex

$$0 \leftarrow \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{O}_{X_w}) \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_w}) \leftarrow 0.$$

Since $\mathcal{F}_j$ is $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}$-free,

$$\mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{F}_j, \mathcal{O}_{X_w}) \simeq \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{X_w}}(\mathcal{F}_j \underset{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}{\otimes} \mathcal{O}_{X_w}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w}).$$

Now, the first part of the proposition follows from Corollary 5.3 applied to $d = \ell(w)$ and Proposition 5.1, by observing that the sheaf $\mathscr{E}xt^j_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w})$ has support in $X^u \cap X_w$, X_w is an irreducible CM variety (cf. [K, Theorem 8.2.2(c)]), and for $u \leq w$, $\operatorname{codim}_{X_w}(X^u \cap X_w) = \ell(u)$ (see [K, Lemma 7.3.10]).

The second assertion of the proposition follows from the first part and Proposition 5.1. □

As a consequence of Proposition 5.4, we prove Theorem 4.10 (a).

Proof of Theorem 4.10 (a). Since the assertion is local in $\mathbb{P}$, we can assume that $\tilde{\bar{Y}} \simeq \mathbb{P} \times \bar{Y}$. Thus,

$$\pi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}) \boxtimes \mathcal{O}_{\bar{\mathrm{Y}}} \tag{33}$$

$$\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}} \boxtimes (\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v) \tag{34}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{X_w \times X_w}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}} \boxtimes (\mathcal{O}_{X_w} \boxtimes \mathcal{O}_{X_w}). \tag{35}$$

Take a locally free resolution of $\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v$ on an open subset of $\bar{Y}$ of the form $V^{u'} \times V^{v'}$:

$$\cdots \to \mathcal{F}_1 \to \mathcal{F}_0 \to \xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v.$$

Then, by Proposition 5.4,

$$(36)\qquad (\mathscr{O}_{X_w} \boxtimes \mathscr{O}_{X_w}) \underset{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{Y}}}{\otimes} \mathcal{F}_1 \to (\mathscr{O}_{X_w} \boxtimes \mathscr{O}_{X_w}) \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{Y}}} \mathcal{F}_0 \to (\mathscr{O}_{X_w} \boxtimes \mathscr{O}_{X_w}) \underset{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{Y}}}{\otimes} (\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v) \to 0$$

is a resolution.

We assert that for any $\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{Y}_w}$-module $\mathcal{S}$ (where $\tilde{Y}_w := \widetilde{X_w \times X_w}$)

$$(37)\qquad \mathscr{T}or_i^{\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\bar{Y}}}}\Big(\pi^*(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}})) \otimes (\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v}), \mathcal{S}\Big) \simeq \mathscr{T}or_i^{\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{Y}_w}}\Big(\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{Y}_w} \underset{\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\bar{Y}}}}{\otimes} (\pi^*\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}) \otimes (\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v})), \mathcal{S}\Big).$$

To prove (37), from the exactness of (36) and the isomorphisms (33) –(35), it suffices to observe the following:

Let R, S be commutative rings with ring homomorphism $R \to S$, M an R-module and N an S-module, then as in [AM, Exercise 2.15, page 27],

$$N \otimes_S (S \otimes_R M) \simeq N \otimes_R M.$$

We now apply Lemma 4.7, Proposition 5.4, [AGM, Theorem 2.3], and the identities (33) –(35) and (37) to conclude that there exists a dense open subset of $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that

$$(38)\qquad \mathscr{T}or_i^{\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{Y}_w}}\Big(\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{Y}_w} \underset{\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\bar{Y}}}}{\otimes} (\pi^*\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}) \otimes (\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v})), \gamma_*\tilde{\Delta}_*\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{X}_w}\Big) = 0, \text{ for all } i > 0.$$

Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathscr{T}or_i^{\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{Y}_w}}\Big(\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{Y}_w} \underset{\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\bar{Y}}}}{\otimes} (\pi^*\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}) \otimes (\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v})), \gamma_*\tilde{\Delta}_*\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{X}_w}\Big)\\ &\qquad \simeq \mathscr{T}or_i^{\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{Y}_w}}\Big((\gamma^{-1})_*(\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{Y}_w} \underset{\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\bar{Y}}}}{\otimes} (\pi^*\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}) \otimes (\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v}))), \tilde{\Delta}_*\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{X}_w}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.7, the closures of Γ-orbits in $\tilde{Y}_w$ are precisely $\widetilde{X_x \times X_y}$, for $x, y \leq w$. Further, by the identities (33) - (35), and Proposition 5.4, $\mathcal{F} := \mathscr{O}_{\tilde{Y}_w} \underset{\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\bar{Y}}}}{\otimes} (\pi^*\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}) \otimes (\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v}))$ is homologically transverse to the Γ-orbit closures in $\tilde{Y}_w$. Thus, applying [AGM, Theorem 2.3] (with their $G = \Gamma$, $X = \tilde{Y}_w$, $\mathcal{E} = \tilde{\Delta}_*\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{X}_w}$, and their $\mathcal{F}$ as the above $\mathcal{F}$) we get the identity (38). (Observe that even though Γ is infinite dimensional, its action on $\tilde{Y}_w$ factors through the action of a finite dimensional quotient group $\bar{\Gamma}$ of Γ. Also, obeserve that for any ring homomorphism $R \to S$, R-module M and S-module N, $\mathrm{Tor}_i^R(M, N) \simeq \mathrm{Tor}_i^S(S \otimes_R M, N)$.)

Observe that $\gamma(\tilde{\Delta}\tilde{X}_w) \subset \tilde{Y}_w$ and thus by (37)-(38), we get

$$\mathscr{T}or_i^{\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\bar{Y}}}}(\pi^*(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}})) \otimes (\widetilde{\xi^u \boxtimes \xi^v}), \gamma_*\tilde{\Delta}_*\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{X}_w}) = 0, \text{ for all } i > 0.$$

This proves Theorem 4.10 (a). □

5.5 Lemma. *For any $u, w \in W$,*

$$\mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{X_w}) = 0, \qquad \textit{for all } j > 0.$$

Proof. We can of course replace $\bar{X}$ by the open set V^v (for $v \in W$) and consider the free resolution by $\mathcal{O}_{V^v}$-modules of finite rank:

$$0 \to \mathcal{F}_n \xrightarrow{\delta_{n-1}} \mathcal{F}_{n-1} \to \cdots \xrightarrow{\delta_0} \mathcal{F}_0 \to \mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap V^v} \to 0.$$

By downward induction, we show that $\mathcal{D}_i := \operatorname{Im} \delta_i$ is a direct summand of $\mathcal{F}_i$, for all $i \geq \ell(u)$. Of course, the assertion holds for $i = n$. By induction, assume that $\mathcal{D}_{i+1}$ is a direct summand (where $i \geq \ell(u)$). Thus,

$$(C_1) \qquad 0 \to \mathcal{D}_{i+1}^{\perp} \xrightarrow{\delta_i} \mathcal{F}_i \to \cdots \to \mathcal{F}_0 \to \mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap V^v} \to 0$$

is a free resolution, where $\mathcal{D}_{i+1}^{\perp}$ is any $\mathcal{O}_{V^v}$-submodule of $\mathcal{F}_{i+1}$ such that $\mathcal{D}_{i+1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{i+1}^{\perp} = \mathcal{F}_{i+1}$.

Consider the short exact sequence:

$$(C_2) \qquad 0 \to \mathcal{D}_{i+1}^{\perp} \xrightarrow{\delta_i} \mathcal{F}_i \to \mathcal{F}_i/\delta_i(\mathcal{D}_{i+1}^{\perp}) \to 0.$$

This gives rise to the exact sequence:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \to &\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{F}_i/\delta_i(\mathcal{D}_{i+1}^{\perp}), \mathcal{O}_{V^v}) \to \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{O}_{V^v}) \xrightarrow{\delta_i^*} \\ &\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{D}_{i+1}^{\perp}, \mathcal{O}_{V^v}) \to \mathcal{E}xt^1_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{F}_i/\delta_i(\mathcal{D}_{i+1}^{\perp}), \mathcal{O}_{V^v}) \to 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last zero is due to the fact that $\mathcal{F}_i$ is $\mathcal{O}_{V^v}$-free.

From the resolution (C_1) and the identity (1) (since $i \geq \ell(u)$ by assumption), we see that the above map δ_i^* is surjective. Hence,

$$\mathcal{E}xt^1_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{F}_i/\delta_i(\mathcal{D}_{i+1}^{\perp}), \mathcal{O}_{V^v}) = 0$$

and hence

$$\mathcal{E}xt^1_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{F}_i/\delta_i(\mathcal{D}_{i+1}^{\perp}), \mathcal{D}_{i+1}^{\perp}) = 0,$$

since $\mathcal{D}_{i+1}^{\perp}$ is a free $\mathcal{O}_{V^v}$-module.

Thus, the short exact sequence (C_2) splits. In particular, $\mathcal{D}_i = \operatorname{Im} \delta_i$ is a direct summand. This completes the induction and hence we get a free resolution:

$$(C_3) \qquad 0 \to \mathcal{D}_{\ell(u)}^{\perp} \to \mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)-1} \to \cdots \to \mathcal{F}_0 \to \mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap V^v} \to 0.$$

In particular,

$$\mathcal{T}or_j^{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w}) = 0, \quad \text{for all } j > \ell(u).$$

Of course, $\mathcal{T}or_j^{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w})$, restricted to V^v, is the j-th homology of the chain complex (which is a complex of finitely generated free $\mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}$-modules)

$$(C_4) \qquad 0 \to \mathcal{D}_{\ell(u)}^{\perp} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v} \to \mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)-1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v} \to \cdots \to \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v} \to 0.$$

Clearly, the support of the homology $\oplus_{i \geq 1} \mathcal{H}_i(C_4)$ is contained in $X^u \cap X_w$. As observed in the proof of Proposition 5.4, $X^u \cap X_w$ is of codimension $\ell(u)$ in X_w.

Thus, by Lemma 5.2 with $d = \ell(w)$,

$$\mathcal{H}_i(C_4) = 0, \qquad \text{for all } i > 0.$$

This proves the lemma. □

As a consequence of the above lemma, we get the following.

5.6 Lemma. *For any $u, w \in W$ and any $j \geq 0$,*

$$\mathscr{E}xt^j_{\mathcal{O}_{X_w}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap X_w}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w}) = 0, \qquad \text{for } j \neq \ell(u). \tag{39}$$

Moreover,

$$\mathscr{E}xt^j_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u}, \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w} \simeq \mathscr{E}xt^j_{\mathcal{O}_{X_w}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap X_w}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w}). \tag{40}$$

.

Proof. Again we can replace $\bar{X}$ by V^v (for $v \in W$). Consider a $\mathcal{O}_{V^v}$-free resolution (cf. the proof of Lemma 5.5):

$$0 \to \mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)} \to \cdots \to \mathcal{F}_0 \to \mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap V^v} \to 0.$$

By Lemma 5.5, the following is a free $\mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}$-module resolution:

$$0 \to \mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v} \to \cdots \to \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v} \to \mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap V^v} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v} \to 0.$$

Observe that $\mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap V^v} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap X_w \cap V^v}$, since for any closed subschemes B, C of a scheme A, $\mathcal{O}_B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_A} \mathcal{O}_C \cong \mathcal{O}_{B \cap C}$. Thus, $\mathscr{E}xt^j_{\mathcal{O}_{X_w}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap X_w}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w})$, restricted to the open set $X_w \cap V^v$, is the j-th cohomology of the cochain complex:

$$0 \leftarrow \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}}\Big(\mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}\Big) \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}}\Big(\mathcal{F}_0 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}\Big) \leftarrow 0.$$

By Lemma 5.2, we get $\mathscr{E}xt^j_{\mathcal{O}_{X_w}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap X_w}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w}) = 0$, for any $j \neq \ell(u)$. This proves (39).

For any i,

$$\mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}}\Big(\mathcal{F}_i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}\Big) \simeq \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{O}_{V^v}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}. \tag{41}$$

Further, by the identity (1),

$$0 \leftarrow \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap V^v}, \mathcal{O}_{V^v}) \leftarrow \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)}, \mathcal{O}_{V^v}) \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{O}_{V^v}) \leftarrow 0$$

is a free $\mathcal{O}_{V^v}$-module resolution of $\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap V^v}, \mathcal{O}_{V^v})$. Hence,

$$\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(w)-j}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_w}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap X_w}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w}) \simeq \mathscr{T}or_j^{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u}, \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}), \mathcal{O}_{X_w}) = 0, \qquad \text{for all } j \geq 1.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leftarrow & \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap V^v}, \mathcal{O}_{V^v}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v} \leftarrow \\ & \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)}, \mathcal{O}_{V^v}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v} \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{O}_{V^v}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v} \leftarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

is exact. Using the identification (41), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leftarrow & \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap V^v}, \mathcal{O}_{V^v}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v} \leftarrow \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}}\Big(\mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}\Big) \leftarrow \cdots \\ & \leftarrow \mathscr{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}}\Big(\mathcal{F}_0 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{V^v}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w \cap V^v}\Big) \leftarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

is exact. Thus,

$$\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathcal{O}_{X_w}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u \cap X_w}, \mathcal{O}_{X_w}) \simeq \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathcal{O}_{X^u}, \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{X}}} \mathcal{O}_{X_w}.$$

This proves (40), by using the identity (1) and (39). □

5.7 Lemma. *For any $v \leq w$ and $u \in W$,*

$$\mathscr{T}or_i^{\mathscr{O}_{X_w}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u \cap X_w}, \mathscr{O}_{X_v}) = 0, \quad \textit{for all } i > 0.$$

Proof. We can replace $\bar{X}$ by V^θ (for $\theta \in W$). Take a $\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}$-free resolution (see (C_3) of Lemma 5.5):

$$0 \to \mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)} \to \cdots \to \mathcal{F}_1 \to \mathcal{F}_0 \to \mathscr{O}_{X^u} \to 0.$$

By Lemma 5.5,

$$(\mathcal{S}_1) \qquad 0 \to \mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}} \mathscr{O}_{X_w} \to \cdots \to \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}} \mathscr{O}_{X_w} \to \mathscr{O}_{X^u \cap X_w} \to 0$$

is a $\mathscr{O}_{X_w}$-free resolution of $\mathscr{O}_{X^u \cap X_w}$. Thus, by the base extension (cf. [L, §3, Chap. XVI]), $\mathscr{T}or_i^{\mathscr{O}_{X_w}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u \cap X_w}, \mathscr{O}_{X_v})$ is the i-th homology of the complex:

$$0 \to \mathcal{F}_{\ell(u)} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}} \mathscr{O}_{X_v} \to \cdots \to \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}} \mathscr{O}_{X_v} \to 0.$$

From the exactness of $(\mathcal{S}_1)$ for w replaced by v, we get the lemma. □

6 Desingularization of Richardson varieties and flatness for the Γ-action

Let $S \subset W$ be a finite ideal and, as in Definition 3.1, let V^s be the corresponding B^--stable open subset $\cup_{w \in S} (w\, B^- \cdot x_o)$ of $\bar{X}$, where x_o is the base point $1.B$ of $\bar{X}$. It is a B^--stable subset since

$$V^S = \bigcup_{w \in S} B^- w x_o.$$

6.1 Lemma. *For any $v \in W$ and any finite ideal $S \subset W$ containing v, there exists a closed normal subgroup N_S^- of B^- of finite codimension such that the quotient $Y^v(S) := N_S^- \setminus X^v(S)$ acquires a canonical structure of a B^--scheme of finite type over the base field $\mathbb{C}$ under the left multiplication action of B^- on $Y^v(S)$, so that the quotient $q : X^v(S) \to Y^v(S)$ is a principal N_S^--bundle, where $X^v(S) := X^v \cap V^S$.*

Of course, the map q is B^--equivariant.

Proof. For any $u \in W$, the subgroup $U_u^- := U^- \cap uU^-u^{-1}$ acts freely and transitively on C^u via left multiplication, since $C^u = (U^- \cap uU^-u^{-1})uB/B$. Thus, $U_S^- := \cap_{u \in S} U_u^-$ acts freely on V^S. Moreover, all the U_S^--orbits in V^S are closed in V^S, for otherwise, if some orbit $O \subset V^S$ is not closed, then any element in $\bar{O} \setminus O$ would have nontrivial isotropy. In particular, U_S^- acts freely and properly on $X^v(S)$. Take any closed normal subgroup N_S^- of B^- of finite codimension contained in U_S^-. Then, the quotient $Y^v(S) := N_S^- \setminus X^v(S)$ acquires a canonical structure of a B^--scheme of finite type over $\mathbb{C}$ under the left multiplication action of B^- on $Y^v(S)$, so that the quotient $q : X^v(S) \to Y^v(S)$ is a principal N_S^--bundle. Of course, the quotient map q is B^--equivariant. □

6.2 Remark. (a) The above lemma allows us to define various local properties of X^v. In particular, a point $x \in X^v$ is called *normal* (resp. *CM*) if the corresponding point in the quotient $Y^v(S)$ has that property, where S is a finite ideal such that $x \in X^v(S)$. Clearly, the property does not depend upon the choice of S and N_S^-.

(b) It is possible that the scheme $Y^v(S)$ is not separated. However, as observed by M. Kashiwara (in a private communication to me), that we can choose our closed normal subgroup N_S^- of B^- of finite codimension contained in U_S^- appropriately so that $Y^v(S)$ is indeed separated.

6.3 Theorem. *For any $v \in W$ and any finite ideal $S \subset W$ containing v, there exists a smooth irreducible B^--scheme $Z^v(S)$ and a projective B^--equivariant morphism*

$$\pi_S^v : Z^v(S) \to X^v(S),$$

satisfying the following conditions:

(a) The restriction $(\pi_S^v)^{-1}(C^v) \to C^v$ is an isomorphism.

(b) $\partial Z^v(S) := (\pi_S^v)^{-1}(\partial X^v(S))$ is a divisor with simple normal crossings, where $X^v(S) := X^v \cap V^S$ and $\partial X^v(S) := (\partial X^v) \cap V^S$.

(Here smoothness of $Z^v(S)$ means that there exists a closed subgroup N_S^- of B^- of finite codimension which acts freely and properly on $Z^v(S)$, such that the quotient is a smooth scheme of finite type over $\mathbb{C}$.)

Proof. Observe that the action of B^- on $Y^v(S)$ factors through the action of the finite dimensional algebraic group B^-/N_S^-, where $Y^v(S)$ is as defined in Lemma 6.1. Now, take a B^--equivariant desingularization $\theta : \bar{Z}^v(S) \to Y^v(S)$ such that θ is a projective morphism, $\theta^{-1}(N_S^- \backslash C^v) \to N_S^- \backslash C^v$ is an isomorphism and $\theta^{-1}(N_S^- \backslash (\partial X^v(S)))$ is a divisor with simple normal crossings (cf. [BM], [RY]). Now, taking the fiber product

$$Z^v(S) = \bar{Z}^v(S) \times_{Y^v(S)} X^v(S)$$

clearly proves the theorem. □

For $w \in W$, take the ideal $S_w = \{u \leq w\}$. Then, by [K, Lemma 7.1.22(b)],

$$X^v(S_w) \cap X_w = X_w^v.$$

6.4 Lemma. *The map*

$$\mu_w : U^- \times Z_w \to \bar{X}, \quad (g, z) \mapsto g \cdot \theta_w(z)$$

is a smooth morphism, where $\theta_w : Z_w \to X_w$ is the B-equivariant BSDH desingularization corresponding to a fixed reduced decomposition $w = s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_n}$ (cf. proof of Proposition 4.1).

Proof. We prove this by induction on $\ell(w)$. If $\ell(w) = 0$, it is clearly true since the map is an open embedding. So take $w = w' s_{i_n}$ with $\ell(w) > \ell(w')$. We have the following Cartesian diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
U^- \times Z_w \arrow[r, "\mu_w"] \arrow[d] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & \bar{X} \arrow[d, "\pi_{i_n}"] \\
U^- \times Z_{w'} \arrow[r, "\hat{\mu}_{w'}"'] & G/P_{i_n}.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Here the left side vertical map is the standard projection and the bottom horizontal map $\hat{\mu}_{w'} := \pi_{i_n} \circ \mu_{w'}$. By induction, $\mu_{w'}$ is a smooth morphism. Moreover, π_{i_n} is a smooth morphism and hence so is $\hat{\mu}_{w'}$. But since the above diagram is a Cartesian diagram, μ_w is a smooth morphism.

(*Another Proof*) : Consider the map

$$G \overset{B}{\times} Z_w \to \bar{X}, \quad [g, z] \mapsto g\theta_w(z).$$

Because of the G-equivariance, it is a locally trivial fibration. Moreover, it is easy to see that it has smooth fibers of finite type over $\mathbb{C}$. In particular, it is a smooth morphism and hence so is its restriction to the open subset $U^- \times Z_w$. □

6.5 Proposition. *For any symmetrizable Kac-Moody group G and any $v \leq w \in W$, the Richardson variety $X_w^v := X_w \cap X^v \subset \bar{X}$ is irreducible, normal and CM (and, of course, of finite type over $\mathbb{C}$ since so is X_w).*

Moreover, $C_w \cap C^v$ is an open dense subset of X_w^v.

Proof. Consider the multiplication map

$$\mu : G \times^B X_w \to \bar{X}, \quad [g, x] \mapsto gx.$$

Then, μ being G-equivariant, it is a fibration. Consider the pull-back fibration:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
F_w^v \arrow[r, hook, "\hat{i}"] \arrow[d, "\hat{\mu}"'] & G \times^B X_w \arrow[d, "\mu"] \\
X^v \arrow[r, hook, "i"'] & \bar{X} \,,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where i is the inclusion map.

Also, consider the projection map

$$\pi : G \times^B X_w \to \bar{X}, \quad [g, x] \mapsto gB.$$

Let $\hat{\pi}$ be the restriction $\hat{\pi} := \pi \circ \hat{i} : F_w^v \to \bar{X}$. Observe that i being B^--equivariant (and μ is G-equivariant) $\hat{i}$ is B^--equivariant and hence so is $\hat{\pi}$. In particular, $\hat{\pi}$ is a fibration over the open cell $B^-B/B \subset \bar{X}$.

Now, by [KS, Propositions 3.2, 3.4], X^v is normal and CM (and, of course, irreducible). Also, $X_{w^{-1}}$ is normal, irreducible and CM [K, Theorem 8.2.2]. Thus, $\hat{\mu}$ being a fibration with fiber $X_{w^{-1}}, F_w^v$ is irreducible, normal and CM, and hence so is its open subset $\hat{\pi}^{-1}(B^-B/B)$. But, $\hat{\pi}$ is a fibration restricted to B^-B/B with fiber over $1 \cdot B$ equal to $X_w^v = X_w \cap X^v$. Thus, we get that X_w^v is irreducible, normal and CM under the scheme theoretic intersection. However, since X_w^v is Frobenius split in char. $p > 0$ (cf. [KuS, Proposition 5.3]), we get that it is reduced.

Clearly, $C_w \cap C^v$ is an open subset of X_w^v. So, to prove that $C_w \cap C^v$ is dense in X_w^v, it suffices to show that it is nonempty, which follows from the proof of [K, Lemma 7.3.10]. □

6.6 Remark. By the same proof as above, applying Corollary 10.5, we see that $X_w \cap \partial X^v$ is CM.

6.7 Theorem. *For any $v \leq w$, consider the fiber product*

$$Z^v(S_w) \underset{\bar{X}}{\times} Z_w,$$

where Z_w is the BSDH (B-equivariant) desingularization of X_w (corresponding to a fixed reduced decomposition $w = s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_n}$ of w) and $\pi^v_{S_w} : Z^v(S_w) \to X^v(S_w)$ is a B^--equivariant desingularization of $X^v(S_w)$ as in Theorem 6.3.

Then, $Z^v(S_w) \times_{\bar{X}} Z_w$ is a smooth projective irreducible T-variety (of finite type over $\mathbb{C}$) with a canonical T-equivariant morphism

$$\pi^v_w : Z^v(S_w) \underset{\bar{X}}{\times} Z_w \to X^v_w.$$

Moreover, π^v_w is a T-equivariant desingularization. From now on, we abbreviate

$$Z^v_w := Z^v(S_w) \underset{\bar{X}}{\times} Z_w.$$

Proof. Consider the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Z^v(S_w) \underset{\bar{X}}{\times} Z_w \arrow[r] \arrow[ddr, "\pi^v_w"'] & X^v(S_w) \underset{\bar{X}}{\times} X_w \arrow[d, equal] \\
& X^v(S_w) \cap X_w \arrow[d, equal] \\
& X^v_w,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the horizontal map is the fiber product of the two desingularizations and π^v_w is the horizontal map under the above identification of $X^v(S_w) \underset{\bar{X}}{\times} X_w$ with X^v_w. Clearly, π^v_w is T-equivariant and it is an isomorphism restricted to the inverse image of the dense open subset $C^v \cap C_w$ of X^v_w. In particular, π^v_w is birational.

Define E^v_w as the fiber product

$$\begin{tikzcd}
E^v_w \arrow[r, "\hat{\mu}^v_w"] \arrow[d, "f^v_w"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & Z^v(S_w) \arrow[d, "\pi^v_{S_w}"] \\
U^- \times Z_w \arrow[r, "\mu_w"'] & \bar{X},
\end{tikzcd}$$

where μ_w is as in Lemma 6.4. Since μ_w is a smooth morphism by Lemma 6.4, so is $\hat{\mu}^v_w$. But $Z^v(S_w)$ is a smooth scheme and hence so is E^v_w. Now, since both of $U^- \times Z_w$ and $Z^v(S_w)$ are U^--schemes (with U^- acting on $U^- \times Z_w$ via the left multiplication on the first factor) and the morphisms $\pi^v_{S_w}$ and μ_w are U^--equivariant, E^v_w is a U^--scheme (and f^v_w is U^--equivariant). Consider the composite morphism

$$E^v_w \xrightarrow{f^v_w} U^- \times Z_w \xrightarrow{\pi_1} U^-,$$

where π_1 is the projection on the first factor.

It is U^--equivariant with respect to the left multiplication of U^- on U^-. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be the fiber of $\pi_1 \circ f_w^v$ over 1. Define the isomorphism

$$\begin{tikzcd}
E_w^v \arrow[dr, "\pi_1 \circ f_w^v"'] & & U^- \times \mathbb{F} \arrow[ll, "\sim", "\theta"'] \arrow[dl, "\bar{\pi}_1"] \\
& U^- &
\end{tikzcd}$$

$$\theta(g, x) = g \cdot x, \;\; \theta^{-1}(y) = \left((\pi_1 \circ f_w^v)(y), (\pi_1 \circ f_w^v(y))^{-1} y\right).$$

Since E_w^v is a smooth scheme, so is $\mathbb{F}$.

But,

$$\mathbb{F} := Z_w^v.$$

Now, $\pi_{S_w}^v$ is a projective morphism onto $X^v(S_w)$ and hence $\pi_{S_w}^v$ is a projective morphism considered as a map $Z^v(S_w) \to V^{S_w}$. Also, μ_w has its image inside V^{S_w}, since $BuB/B \subset uB^-B/B$ for any $u \in W$.

Thus, f_w^v is a projective morphism and hence

$$(f_w^v)^{-1}(1 \times Z_w) = Z_w^v$$

is a projective variety.

Now, as observed by D. Anderson and independently by M. Kashiwara, Z_w^v is irreducible:

Since $Z^v(S_w) \to X^v(S_w)$ is a proper desingularization, all its fibers are connected and hence so are all the nonempty fibers of f_w^v. Now, $\mu_w^{-1}(\operatorname{Im} \pi_{S_w}^v) = U^- \times Y$, where $Y \subset Z_w$ is the closed subvariety defined as the inverse image of the Richardson variety X_w^v under the BSDH desingularization $\theta_w : Z_w \to X_w$. Since X_w^v is irreducible, θ_w is proper, and all the fibers of θ_w are connected, $Y = \theta_w^{-1}(X_w^v)$ is connected and hence so is $\mu_w^{-1}(\operatorname{Im} \pi_{S_w}^v)$. Since the pull-back of a proper morphism is proper (cf. [H, Corollary 4.8, Chap. II]), the surjective morphism $f_w^v : E_w^v \to U^- \times Y$ is proper. Now, $U^- \times Y$ being connected and all the fibers of f_w^v over $U^- \times Y$ are nonempty and connected, we get that E_w^v is connected and hence so is $\mathbb{F}$. Thus, $\mathbb{F}$ being smooth, it is irreducible. This proves the theorem. $\square$

The action of B on Z_w factors through the action of a finite dimensional quotient group $\bar{B} = B_w$ containing the maximal torus H. Let $\bar{U}$ be the image of U in $\bar{B}$.

6.8 Lemma. *For any $u \leq w$, the map $\bar{\mu} : \bar{U} \times Z_w^u \to Z_w$ is a smooth morphisms and hence so is $\bar{B} \times Z_w^u \to Z_w$, where $(b, z) \mapsto b \cdot \pi_2(z)$, for $b \in \bar{B}, z \in Z_w^u$. (Here $\pi_2 : Z_w^u \to Z_w$ is the canonical projection map.)*

Proof. First of all, the map

$$\mu' : G \times^{B^-} Z^u(S_w) \to \bar{X}, \quad [g, z] \mapsto g \pi_{S_w}^u(z)$$

being G-equivariant, is a locally trivial fibration. In particular, its defferential is surjective at the Zariski tangent spaces.

We next claim that the following diagram is a Cartesian diagram:

$$(\mathfrak{D}) \qquad \begin{tikzcd} U \times Z^u_w \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\mu"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & U \times Z^u(S_w) \arrow[d, "\hat{\mu}'"] \\ Z_w \arrow[r] & \bar{X}, \end{tikzcd}$$

where $\mu(u, z) = u \cdot \pi_2(z)$ and $\hat{\mu}'(u, z) = u \cdot \pi^u_{S_w}(z)$. Define the map

$$\theta : U \times Z^u_w \to (U \times Z^u(S_w)) \underset{\bar{X}}{\times} Z_w, \quad (u, z) \mapsto ((u, \pi_1(z)), u \cdot \pi_2(z)),$$

where $\pi_2 : Z^u_w \to Z_w$ and $\pi_1 : Z^u_w \to Z^u(S_w)$ are the canonical morphisms.

Define the map

$$\theta' : (U \times Z^u(S_w)) \underset{\bar{X}}{\times} Z_w \to U \times Z^u_w, \quad ((u, z_1), z_2) \mapsto (u, (z_1, u^{-1} z_2)).$$

Clearly θ and θ' are inverses to each other and hence θ is an isomorphism. Thus, the above diagram $(\mathfrak{D})$ is a Cartesian diagram:

Now, consider the pull-back diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathbb{E} \arrow[r, "\alpha"] \arrow[d, "\beta"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & G \overset{B^-}{\times} Z^u(S_w) \arrow[d, "\mu'"] \\ Z_w \arrow[r] & \bar{X}. \end{tikzcd}$$

Since μ' is a locally trivial fibration, so is the map β. Moreover, since the diagram $(\mathfrak{D})$ is a Cartesian diagram, $\alpha^{-1}(U \times Z^u(S_w)) \simeq U \times Z^u_w$ and $\beta_{|U \times Z^u_w} = \mu$. Thus, the differential of μ is surjective at the Zariski tangent spaces.

Since the morphism $\mu : U \times Z^u_w \to Z_w$ factors through a finite dimensional quotient $\bar{\mu} : \bar{U} \times Z^u_w \to Z_w$, the differential of $\bar{\mu}$ continues to be surjective at the Zariski tangent spaces. Since $\bar{U}$, Z^u_w and Z_w are smooth varieties, we see that $\bar{\mu} : \bar{U} \times Z^u_w \to Z_w$ is a smooth morphism (cf. [H, Chap. III, Proposition 10.4]). This proves the lemma. ◻

6.9 Lemma. *The map $\bar{B} \times X^u_w \to X_w, (b, x) \mapsto b \cdot x$, is a flat morphism for any $u \leq w$.*

Proof. The map

$$\mu : G \times^{U^-} X^u(S_w) \to \bar{X}, \quad [g, x] \mapsto g \cdot x,$$

being G-equivariant, is a fibration. In particular, it is a flat map and hence its restriction (to an open subset) $\mu' : B \times X^u(S_w) \to \bar{X}$ is a flat map. Now, $\mu'^{-1}(X_w) = B \times X^u_w$. Thus, $\mu' : B \times X^u_w \to X_w$ is a flat map. Now, since $B \times X^u_w \to \bar{B} \times X^u_w$ is a locally trivial fibration (in particular, faithfully flat), the map $\bar{B} \times X^u_w \to X_w$ is flat (cf. [M, Chap. 3, §7]). This proves the lemma. ◻

The canonical action of $\Gamma = \Gamma_{B\times B}$ on $\widetilde{Z^2_w}$ descends to the action of a finite dimensional quotient group $\bar{\Gamma} = \Gamma_w$:

$$\Gamma \twoheadrightarrow \bar{\Gamma} = \Gamma_w \twoheadrightarrow GL(N+1)^r,$$

where $\widetilde{Z^2_w}$ and Γ are as in Section 4. In fact, we can (and do) take

$$\bar{\Gamma} = \bar{\Gamma}_0 \ltimes GL(N+1)^r,$$

where $\bar{\Gamma}_0$ is the group of global sections of the bundle $E(T)_{\mathbb{P}} \overset{T}{\times} (\bar{B}^2) \to \mathbb{P}$, where $\bar{B} = B_w$ is defined just above Lemma 6.8.

6.10 Lemma. *For any* $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \ldots, j_r) \in [N]^r$ *and* $u, v \leq w$, *the map*

$$\tilde{m} : \bar{\Gamma} \times (Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}} \to \widetilde{Z^2_w}$$

is a smooth morphism, where $Z^{u,v}_w := Z^u_w \times Z^v_w$ *under the diagonal action of* T, $(Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}$ *is the inverse image of* $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}$ *under the map* $E(T)_{\mathbb{P}} \overset{T}{\times} Z^{u,v}_w \to \mathbb{P}$ *and* $\tilde{m}(\gamma, x) = \gamma \cdot \pi_2(x)$. *(Here* $\pi_2 : (Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}} \to \widetilde{Z^2_w}$ *is the map induced from the canonical projection* $p : Z^u_w \times Z^v_w \to Z^2_w$.*)*

Proof. Consider the following commutative diagram, where both the horizontal right side maps are fibrations with left side as fibers:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bar{\Gamma}_0 \times Z^{u,v}_w \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "m'"] & \bar{\Gamma} \times (Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}} \arrow[r, "\gamma"] \arrow[d, "\tilde{m}"] & GL(N+1)^r \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}} \arrow[d, "m''"] \\
Z^2_w \arrow[r] & \widetilde{Z^2_w} \arrow[r] & \mathbb{P} = (\mathbb{P}^N)^r.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Here m' is the restriction of $\tilde{m}$ and m'' is the restriction of the standard map $GL(N+1)^r \times \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{P}$ induced from the action of $GL(N+1)$ on $\mathbb{P}^N$. Thus, m' takes (γ, z) to $\gamma(*) \cdot p(z)$, where $*$ is the base point in $\mathbb{P}$. Clearly, m'' is a smooth morphism since it is $GL(N+1)^r$-equivariant and $GL(N+1)^r$ acts transitively on $\mathbb{P}$. We next claim that m' is a smooth morphism: By Lemma 4.7, it suffices to show that

$$\bar{B}^2 \times Z^{u,v}_w \to Z^2_w$$

is a smooth morphism, which follows from Lemma 6.8 asserting that $\bar{B} \times Z^u_w \to Z_w$ is a smooth morphism. Since m' and m'' are smooth morphisms, so is $\tilde{m}$ by [H, Chap. III, Proposition 10.4]. □

6.11 Lemma. *Let* $u, v \leq w$. *The map* $m : \bar{\Gamma} \times (X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}} \to \widetilde{X^2_w}$ *is flat, where* m *is defined similarly to the map* $\tilde{m} : \bar{\Gamma} \times (Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}} \to \widetilde{Z^2_w}$ *as in Lemma 6.10.*

Similarly, its restriction $m' : \bar{\Gamma} \times \partial((X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}) \to \widetilde{X^2_w}$ *is flat, where*

$$\partial\left((X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}\right) := \left((\partial X^{u,v}) \cap (X^2_w)\right)_{\mathbf{j}} \cup (X^{u,v}_w)_{\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}},$$

$(X^{u,v}_w)_{\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}$ *is the inverse image of* $\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}$ *under the standard quotient map* $E(T)_{\mathbb{P}} \times^T X^{u,v}_w \to \mathbb{P}$, *and* $\partial X^{u,v} := ((\partial X^u) \times X^v) \cup (X^u \times (\partial X^v))$.

Proof. Consider the following diagram where both the horizontal right side maps are locally trivial fibrations with left side as fibers:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{\Gamma}_0 \times X_w^{u,v} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\hat{m}'"] & \overline{\Gamma} \times (X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "m"] & GL(N+1)^r \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}} \arrow[d, "m''"] \\
X_w^2 \arrow[r] & \widetilde{X_w^2} \arrow[r] & \mathbb{P} = (\mathbb{P}^N)^r
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since the two horizontal maps are fibrations and m'' is a smooth morphism (cf. proof of Lemma 6.10), it suffices to show that $\hat{m}' : \overline{\Gamma}_0 \times X_w^{u,v} \to X_w^2$ is a flat morphism. By Lemma 4.7, it suffices to show that

$$(\overline{B}^2) \times X_w^{u,v} \to X_w^2$$

is a flat morphism, which folows from Lemma 6.9.

To prove that the map $\overline{\Gamma} \times \partial((X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}) \to \widetilde{X_w^2}$ is flat, observe that (by the same proof as that of the first part) it is flat restricted to the components $\Gamma_1 := \overline{\Gamma} \times ((\partial X^{u,v}) \cap X_w^2)_{\mathbf{j}}$ and $\Gamma_2 := \overline{\Gamma} \times (X_w^{u,v})_{\partial \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}$ and also restricted to the intersection $\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2$. Thus, it is flat on $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$, since for affine scheme $Y = Y_1 \cup Y_2$, with closed subschemes Y_1, Y_2, the sequence

$$0 \to k[Y] \to k[Y_1] \oplus k[Y_2] \to k[Y_1 \cap Y_2] \to 0$$

is exact. □

7 $\mathcal{Z}$ is Cohen-Macaulay

Recall the definition of $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}$ and the embedding $\tilde{\Delta}$ from Section 4. Fix $u, v \leq w$. Also recall the definition of the quotient group $\overline{\Gamma} = \Gamma_w$ of Γ and the map $\tilde{m}$ from Lemma 6.10 and the map m from Lemma 6.11.

In the following commutative diagram, $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is defined as the fiber product $(\overline{\Gamma} \times (Z_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}) \times_{\widetilde{Z_w^2}} \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)$; $\mathcal{Z}$ is defined as the fiber product $(\overline{\Gamma} \times (X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}) \times_{\widetilde{X_w^2}} \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)$; and $\mathcal{Z}'$ is defined as the fiber product $\mathcal{Z} \times_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)} \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)$. In particular, all of $\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}', \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ are schemes of finite type over $\mathbb{C}$. The map f is the restriction of θ to $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ (via $\tilde{i}$) with image inside $\mathcal{Z}$. The maps $\tilde{\pi}, \pi$ and π' are obtained from the projections to the $\overline{\Gamma}$-factor via the maps $\tilde{i}, i$ and $i \circ \varphi'$ respectively. The map f' is obtained from the fiber product of f and $\tilde{\mu}$.

7.1 Lemma. Pic $\overline{\Gamma}$ *is trivial.*

Proof. First of all, by definition given above Lemma 6.10, $\overline{\Gamma}$ is the semi-direct product of $GL(N+1)^r$ with $\overline{\Gamma}_0 = \Gamma(E(T)_{\mathbb{P}} \overset{T}{\times} (\overline{B}^2)) \simeq H^2 \times \Gamma(E(T)_{\mathbb{P}} \overset{T}{\times} (\overline{U}^2))$.

Since $\overline{U}^2$ is T-isomorphic with its Lie algebra, $\Gamma(E(T)_{\mathbb{P}} \overset{T}{\times} (\overline{U}^2))$ is an affine space. Thus, as a variety, $\overline{\Gamma}$ (which is isomorphic with $GL(N+1)^r \times H^2 \times \Gamma(E(T)_{\mathbb{P}} \overset{T}{\times} (\overline{U}^2)))$ is an open subset of an affine space $\mathbb{A}^N$. In particular, any prime divisor of $\overline{\Gamma}$ extends to a prime divisor of $\mathbb{A}^N$, and thus its ideal is principal. Hence, $\mathrm{Pic}(\overline{\Gamma}) = \{1\}$. □

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \arrow[r, "\tilde{\mu}", "\text{(Smooth)}"'] \arrow[d, hook, "\tilde{i}"] \arrow[dl, "\tilde{\pi}"'] \arrow[ddd, bend right, "f"'] \arrow[dddd, bend right=80, "f'"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w) \arrow[d, hook] \\
 & \overline{\Gamma} \times \left(Z_w^{u,v}\right)_{\boldsymbol{j}} \arrow[r, "\tilde{m}", "\text{(Smooth)}"'] \arrow[d, "\theta"'] & \widetilde{Z_w^2} \arrow[d] \\
\overline{\Gamma} & \overline{\Gamma} \times (X_w^{u,v})_{\boldsymbol{j}} \arrow[r, "m", "\text{(flat)}"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & \widetilde{X_w^2} \\
 & \mathcal{Z} \arrow[r, "\mu", "\text{(flat)}"'] \arrow[u, hook, "i"'] \arrow[ul, "\pi"] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w) \arrow[u, hook] \\
 & \mathcal{Z}' \arrow[r, "\mu'", "\text{(flat)}"'] \arrow[u, "\varphi'"'] \arrow[uul, "\pi'"] & \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w) \arrow[u, "\text{(resolution)}", "j"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

The following result is a slight variant of [FP, Lemma on page 108].

7.2 Lemma. *Let $f : W \to X$ be a flat morphism from a pure-dimensional CM scheme W of finite type over $\mathbb{C}$ to a CM irreducible variety X and let Y be a closed CM subscheme of X of pure codimension d. Set $Z := f^{-1}(Y)$. If $\operatorname{codim}_Z(W) \geq d$, then equality holds and Z is CM.*

Proof. (due to N. Mohan Kumar) The assertion (and the assumptions) of the lemma is clearly local, so we have a local map $A \to B$ of local rings with B flat over A. If $P \subset A$ is a prime ideal of codimension d with PB of pure codimension d, we only need to check that B/PB is CM. But, A/P is CM, so we can pick a regular sequence $\{a_1, \dots, a_d\}$ mod P. Flatness of f ensures that these remain a regular sequence in B/PB. ◻

We also need the following original [FP, Lemma on page 108].

7.3 Lemma. *Let $f : W \to X$ be a morphism from a pure-dimensional CM scheme W of finite type over $\mathbb{C}$ to a smooth irreducible variety X and let Y be a closed CM subscheme of X of pure codimension d. Set $Z := f^{-1}(Y)$. If $\operatorname{codim}_Z(W) \geq d$, then equality holds and Z is CM.*

7.4 Proposition. *The schemes $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ are irreducible and the map $f : \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \to \mathcal{Z}$ is a proper birational map. Thus, $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is a desingularization of $\mathcal{Z}$.*

Moreover, $\mathcal{Z}$ is CM with

$$\dim \mathcal{Z} = |\mathbf{j}| + \ell(w) - \ell(u) - \ell(v) + \dim \overline{\Gamma}, \tag{42}$$

where $|\mathbf{j}| := \sum_i j_i$ for $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_r)$.

Proof. We first show that $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ and $\mathcal{Z}$ are pure dimensional.

Since $\tilde{m}$ is a smooth (in particular, flat) morphism, $\mathrm{Im}(\tilde{m})$ is an open subset of $\widetilde{Z^2_w}$ (cf. [H, Exercise 9.1, Chap. III]). Moreover, clearly $\mathrm{Im}(\tilde{m}) \supset \widetilde{C^2_w}$, thus $\mathrm{Im}(\tilde{m})$ intersects $\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)$. Applying [H, Corollary 9.6, Chap. III] first to the morphism $\tilde{m} : \bar{\Gamma}\times(Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}} \to \mathrm{Im}(\tilde{m})$ and then to its restriction $\tilde{\mu}$ to $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$, we see that $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is pure dimensional. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} &= \dim \bar{\Gamma} + |\mathbf{j}| + \dim(Z^{u,v}_w) - \dim(\widetilde{Z^2_w}) + \dim(\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)) \\ &= \dim \bar{\Gamma} + |\mathbf{j}| + \ell(w) - \ell(u) - \ell(v). \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

By the same argument, we see that $\mathcal{Z}$ is also pure dimensional.

We now show that $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is irreducible:

The smooth morphism $\tilde{m} : \bar{\Gamma} \times (Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}} \to \widetilde{Z^2_w}$ is $\bar{\Gamma}$-equivariant with respect to the left multiplication of $\bar{\Gamma}$ on the first factor of $\bar{\Gamma} \times (Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}$ and the standard action of $\bar{\Gamma}$ on $\widetilde{Z^2_w}$. Since $\widetilde{C^2_w}$ is a single $\bar{\Gamma}$-orbit (by Lemma 4.7), $\tilde{m}^{-1}(\widetilde{C^2_w}) \to \widetilde{C^2_w}$ is a locally trivial fibration. Further, since the fundamental group $\pi_1(\widetilde{C^2_w}) = \{1\}$ and, of course, $\tilde{m}^{-1}(\widetilde{C^2_w})$ is irreducible (in particular, connected), from the long exact homotopy sequence for the fibration $\tilde{m}^{-1}(\widetilde{C^2_w}) \to \widetilde{C^2_w}$, we get that all its fibers are connected. Thus, the open subset $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \cap \tilde{m}^{-1}(\widetilde{C^2_w})$ is connected as the fibers and the base are connected. Hence, it is irreducible (being smooth). Consider the closure $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_1 := \overline{(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \cap \tilde{m}^{-1}(\widetilde{C^2_w}))}$. Then, $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_1$ is an irreducible component of $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$. If possible, let $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_2$ be another irreducible component of $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$. Then, $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_2) \subset \tilde{\Delta}((Z_w \setminus C_w)_{\mathbb{P}})$. Since $\dim(\tilde{\Delta}((Z_w \setminus C_w)_{\mathbb{P}})) < \dim(\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w))$ and each fiber of $\tilde{\mu}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_2}$ is of dimension at most that of any fiber of $\tilde{\mu}$, we get that $\dim(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_2) < \dim(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_1)$. This is a contradiction since $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is of pure dimension. Thus, $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} = \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_1$ and hence $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is irreducible.

The proof of the irreducibility of $\mathcal{Z}$ is similar. The only extra observation we need to make is that $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \cap \tilde{m}^{-1}(\widetilde{C^2_w})$ maps surjectively onto $\mathcal{Z} \cap m^{-1}(\widetilde{C^2_w})$ under f; in particular, $\mathcal{Z} \cap m^{-1}(\widetilde{C^2_w})$ is irreducible.

The map f is clearly proper. Moreover, it is an isomorphism restricted to the (nonempty) open subset

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \cap (\bar{\Gamma} \times ((C^u \cap C_w) \times (C^v \cap C_w))_{\mathbf{j}})$$

onto its image (which is an open subset of $\mathcal{Z}$). (Here we have identified the inverse image $(\pi^u_w)^{-1}(C^u \cap C_w)$ inside Z^u_w with $C^u \cap C_w$ under the map π^u_w, cf. proof of Theorem 6.7.)

The identity (42) follows from (43) since $\dim \mathcal{Z} = \dim \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$. Thus,

$$\mathrm{codim}_{\mathcal{Z}}\,(\bar{\Gamma} \times (X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}) = \mathrm{codim}_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)}\,(\widetilde{X^2_w}) = \ell(w).$$

Finally, $\mathcal{Z}$ is CM by Proposition 6.5 and Lemmas 6.11 and 7.2. This completes the proof of the proposition. ◻

7.5 Lemma. *The schemes $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\mathcal{Z}'$ are normal, irreducible and CM.*

Proof. By Proposition 7.4, $\mathcal{Z}$ is irreducible and CM.

As in the proof of Lemma 6.9, the map

$$\mu_o : G \times^{U^-} X^u(S'_u) \to \bar{X}, \quad [g, x] \mapsto g \cdot x,$$

being G-equivariant, is a fibration, where $S'_u := \{v \in W : \ell(v) \leq \ell(u) + 1\}$. Moreover, its fibers are clearly isomorphic with $F^u := \overline{\cup_{u \leq v : \ell(v) \leq \ell(u)+1} Bv^{-1}U^-/U^-}$. Now, since X^u is normal (cf. [KS, Proposition 3.2]), $X^u(S'_u)$ is smooth and similarly so is F^u. (Here the smoothness of F^u means that there exists a closed subgroup B_1 of B of finite codimension such that B_1 acts freely on F^u with all closed orbits such that the quotient $B_1 \setminus F^u$ is a smooth scheme of finite type over $\mathbb{C}$.) Thus, μ_o is a smooth morphism and hence so is its restriction to the open subset $B \times X^u(S'_u) \to \bar{X}$. Let $\mu_o(w) : B \times (X^u(S'_u) \cap X_w) \to X_w$ be the restriction of the latter to the inverse image of X_w. The map $\mu_o(w)$ clearly factors through a smooth morphism $\bar{\mu}_o(w) : \bar{B} \times (X^u(S'_u) \cap X_w) \to X_w$, where $\bar{B}$ is a finite dimensional quotient group of B. Hence, $\bar{\mu}_o(w)^{-1}(X^o_w) = \bar{B} \times (X^u(S'_u) \cap X^o_w)$ is a smooth variety, where $X^o_w := X_w \setminus \Sigma_w$ and Σ_w is the singular locus of X_w.

Following the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 6.11, we get that the restriction of the map $m : \bar{\Gamma} \times (X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}} \to \widetilde{X^2_w}$ to the map $\bar{m} : \bar{\Gamma} \times ((X^u(S'_u) \times X^v(S'_v)) \cap X^2_w)_{\mathbf{j}} \to \widetilde{X^2_w}$ is a smooth morphism (with open image Y) and hence so is its restricton $\hat{m} : \bar{m}^{-1}(\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)) \to \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)$. (Observe that Y does intersect $\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)$, for otherwise $(\bar{\Gamma} \cdot \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)) \cap Y = \emptyset$, which would imply that $(\widetilde{C^2_w}) \cap Y = \emptyset$. A contradiction.) Thus, $\hat{m}^{-1}(\tilde{\Delta}(\widetilde{X^o_w}))$ is a smooth variety, which is open in $\mathcal{Z} = m^{-1}(\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w))$. Let us denote the complement of $\bar{\Gamma} \times ((X^u(S'_u) \times X^v(S'_v)) \cap X^2_w)_{\mathbf{j}}$ in $\bar{\Gamma} \times (X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}$ by F and denote $\hat{m}^{-1}(\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{\Sigma}_w))$ by F'. Then, F' is of codimension ≥ 2 in $\hat{m}^{-1}(\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w))$ and hence in $\mathcal{Z}$. Clearly, F is of codimension ≥ 2 in $\bar{\Gamma} \times (X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}$. Also, if F is nonempty, the restriction of the map m to F is again flat (by the same proof as that of Lemma 6.11) with image an open subset of $\widetilde{X^2_w}$ intersecting $\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)$. Thus, the codimension of $F \cap \mathcal{Z}$ in $\mathcal{Z}$ is ≥ 2. This shows that the complement of the smooth locus of $\mathcal{Z}$ in $\mathcal{Z}$ is of codimension ≥ 2. Moreover, $\mathcal{Z}$ is CM by Proposition 7.4. Thus, by Serre's criterion (cf. [H, Theorem 8.22(a), Chap. II]), $\mathcal{Z}$ is normal.

The irreducibility of $\mathcal{Z}'$ follows by the same argument as that of the proof of Proposition 7.4. Since $\mathcal{Z}$ is CM, each fiber of μ is CM by Lemma 7.2 and [H, Corollary 9.6, Chap. III]. Thus, each fiber of μ' is CM. Hence, $\mathcal{Z}'$ is CM (since for a flat morphism between irreducible schemes such that each fiber is CM and the base is CM, then so is the total space). The proof of the normality of $\mathcal{Z}'$ is similar to the above proof. In fact, in this case, the singular locus of $\mathcal{Z}'$ is contained in $(F \cap \mathcal{Z}) \times_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)} \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)$. So, clearly it is of codimension ≥ 2 in $\mathcal{Z}'$. □

7.6 Proposition. *The scheme $\partial\mathcal{Z}$ is pure of codimension 1 in $\mathcal{Z}$ and it is CM, where the closed subscheme $\partial\mathcal{Z}$ of $\mathcal{Z}$ is defined as*

$$\partial\mathcal{Z} := \left(\bar{\Gamma} \times \partial\left((X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}\right)\right) \underset{\widetilde{X^2_w}}{\times} \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w),$$

where $\partial\left((X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}\right)$ is defined in Lemma 6.11.

Proof. By Lemma 6.11, the map $\bar{\Gamma} \times \partial\left((X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}\right) \xrightarrow{m'} \widetilde{X^2_w}$ is a flat morphism. Moreover, $\partial\left((X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}\right)$ is pure of codimension 1 in $(X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}$. Further, $\operatorname{Im} m' = \operatorname{Im} m$, if $\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}} \neq \emptyset$. If $\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}} = \emptyset$,

$$\operatorname{Im} m' = (((\cup_{u \to u' \leq \theta \leq w} C_\theta) \times (\cup_{v \leq \theta' \leq w} C_{\theta'})) \cup ((\cup_{u \leq \theta \leq w} C_\theta) \times (\cup_{v \to v' \leq \theta' \leq w} C_{\theta'})))_{\mathbb{P}}.$$

In particular, if non empty, $\operatorname{Im} m'$ is open in $\widetilde{X^2_w}$ intersecting $\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)$. Thus, by [H, Corollary 9.6, Chap. III], each fiber of m' (if non empty) is pure of dimension

$$\dim \bar{\Gamma} + \dim(X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}} - \dim(\widetilde{X^2_w}) - 1.$$

Again applyig [H, Corollary 9.6, Chap. III], we get that $\partial\mathcal{Z}$ is of dimension

$$\dim\bar{\Gamma} + \dim(X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}} - \dim(\widetilde{X_w^2}) - 1 + \dim(\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)).$$

Hence, $\partial\mathcal{Z}$ is pure of codimension 1 in $\mathcal{Z}$. Further, $\left((\partial X^{u,v}) \cap X_w^2\right)_{\mathbf{j}}$ is CM by Remark 6.6. Also, $(X_w^{u,v})_{\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}$ and the intersection

$$\left((\partial X^{u,v}) \cap X_w^2\right)_{\mathbf{j}} \cap (X_w^{u,v})_{\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}} = \left((\partial X^{u,v}) \cap X_w^2\right)_{\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}$$

are CM since $\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}$ is CM. Thus, their union $\partial\left((X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}\right)$ is CM since the intersection $\left((\partial X^{u,v}) \cap X_w^2\right)_{\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}$ is of pure codimension 1 in both of $\left((\partial X^{u,v}) \cap X_w^2\right)_{\mathbf{j}}$ and $(X_w^{u,v})_{\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}$. Thus, $\partial\mathcal{Z}$ is CM by Lemma 7.2. $\square$

As a consequence of Proposition 7.6 and Lemma 7.3, we get the following.

7.7 Corollary. *Assume that* $c_{u,v}^w(\mathbf{j}) \neq 0$, *where* $c_{u,v}^w(\mathbf{j})$ *is defined by the identity* (19). *Then, for general* $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}$, *the fiber* $N_\gamma := \pi^{-1}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{Z}$ *is CM of pure dimension, where the morphism* $\pi : \mathcal{Z} \to \bar{\Gamma}$ *is defined in the beginning of this section.*

In fact, for any $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}$ *such that*

$$\dim N_\gamma = \dim\mathcal{Z} - \dim\bar{\Gamma} = |\mathbf{j}| + \ell(w) - \ell(u) - \ell(v), \tag{44}$$

N_γ *is CM (and this condition is satisfied for general* γ*).*

Similarly, if $|\mathbf{j}| + \ell(w) - \ell(u) - \ell(v) > 0$, *for general* $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}$, *the fiber* $M_\gamma := {\pi_1}^{-1}(\gamma) \subset \partial\mathcal{Z}$ *is CM of pure codimension* 1 *in* N_γ, *where* π_1 *is the restriction of the map* π *to* $\partial\mathcal{Z}$. *If* $|\mathbf{j}| + \ell(w) - \ell(u) - \ell(v) = 0$, *for general* $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}$, *the fiber* M_γ *is empty.*

In particular, for general $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}$, $\mathcal{O}_{N_\gamma}(-M_\gamma)$ *is a CM* $\mathcal{O}_{N_\gamma}$*-module and hence*

$$\mathcal{E}xt^i_{\mathcal{O}_{N_\gamma}}\left(\mathcal{O}_{N_\gamma}(-M_\gamma), \omega_{N_\gamma}\right) = 0, \quad \textit{for all} \quad i > 0,$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{N_\gamma}(-M_\gamma)$ *denotes the ideal sheaf of* M_γ *in* N_γ.

Proof. We first show that π is a surjective morphism under the assumption that $c_{u,v}^w(\mathbf{j}) \neq 0$. By the definition,

$$\operatorname{Im}\pi = \left\{\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma} : \gamma\left((X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}\right) \cap \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w) \neq \emptyset\right\}. \tag{45}$$

Since $\bar{\Gamma}$ is connected by Lemma 4.8, by the expression of $c_{u,v}^w(\mathbf{j})$ as in Lemma 4.5, $\gamma\left((X^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}\right) \cap \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w) \neq \emptyset$ for any $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}$. But, $\gamma\left((X^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}\right) \cap \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w) = \gamma\left((X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}\right) \cap \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)$, for any $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}$. Thus, π is surjective.

By Lemmas 7.3 and 7.5 applied to the morphism $\pi : \mathcal{Z} \to \bar{\Gamma}$, we get that if

$$\operatorname{codim}_{\mathcal{Z}} N_\gamma = \dim\bar{\Gamma}, \tag{46}$$

then N_γ is CM.

Now the condition (46) is satisfied for γ in a dense open subset of $\overline{\Gamma}$ by [S, Theorem 7, §6.3, Chap. I]. Thus, N_γ is CM for general γ.

Similarly, we prove that M_γ is CM for general γ:

We first show that $\pi_1 : \partial\mathcal{Z} \to \overline{\Gamma}$ is surjective if $|\mathbf{j}| + \ell(w) - \ell(u) - \ell(v) > 0$. For if π_1 is not surjective, its image would be a proper closed subset of $\overline{\Gamma}$, since π_1 is a projective morphism. Hence, for general $\gamma \in \overline{\Gamma}$, $M_\gamma = \emptyset$, i.e., $N_\gamma \subset \mathcal{Z}\backslash\partial\mathcal{Z}$. But $\mathcal{Z}\backslash\partial\mathcal{Z}$ is an affine scheme, and N_γ is a projective scheme of positive dimension (because of the assumption $|\mathbf{j}| + \ell(w) - \ell(u) - \ell(v) > 0$). This is a contradiction. Thus, if $|\mathbf{j}| + \ell(w) - \ell(u) - \ell(v) > 0$, we get that for general $\gamma \in \overline{\Gamma}$, by [S, Theorem 7, §6.3, Chap. I] applied to the irreducible components of $\partial\mathcal{Z}$,

$$\operatorname{codim}_{\partial\mathcal{Z}} M_\gamma = \dim \overline{\Gamma}. \tag{47}$$

Now, by the same argument as above, we get that for general $\gamma \in \overline{\Gamma}$, M_γ is CM. Moreover, since $\partial\mathcal{Z}$ is of pure codimension 1 in $\mathcal{Z}$, we get (by equations (46)-(47)) that M_γ is of pure codimension 1 in N_γ (for general γ).

If $|\mathbf{j}| + \ell(w) - \ell(u) - \ell(v) = 0$, then $\dim(\partial\mathcal{Z}) < \dim \overline{\Gamma}$. So, in this case, $\operatorname{Im}\pi_1$ is a proper closed subset of $\overline{\Gamma}$.

Since (for general γ) M_γ is of pure codimension 1 in N_γ and both are CM, $\mathscr{O}_{N_\gamma}(-M_\gamma)$ is a CM $\mathscr{O}_{N_\gamma}$-module. In particular,

$$\mathscr{E}xt^i_{\mathscr{O}_{N_\gamma}}\left(\mathscr{O}_{N_\gamma}(-M_\gamma), \omega_{N_\gamma}\right) = 0, \quad \text{for all} \quad i > 0.$$

To prove this, use the long exact $\mathscr{E}xt$ sequence associated to the sheaf exact sequence:

$$0 \to \mathscr{O}_{N_\gamma}(-M_\gamma) \to \mathscr{O}_{N_\gamma} \to \mathscr{O}_{M_\gamma} \to 0$$

and the result that

$$\mathscr{E}xt^i_{\mathscr{O}_{N_\gamma}}\left(\mathscr{O}_{M_\gamma}, \omega_{N_\gamma}\right) = 0, \quad \text{unless} \quad i = 1.$$

This completes the proof of the corollary. □

8 Study of the dualizing sheaves of $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ and $\mathcal{Z}$

From now on we assume that $c^w_{u,v}(\mathbf{j}) \neq 0$, where $c^w_{u,v}(\mathbf{j})$ is defined by the identity (19). We follow the notation from the big diagram in Section 7.

8.1 Lemma. *There exists a smooth open subset $\mathcal{Z}_o \subset \mathcal{Z}$ with its complement of codimension ≥ 2 such that $\mu_{|\mathcal{Z}_o} : \mathcal{Z}_o \to \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)^o$ is a smooth morphism, where $\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)^o$ is the smooth locus of $\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)$.*

Proof. For any scheme Y, let Y^o denote its smooth locus and $\Sigma(Y) := Y \setminus Y^o$ its singular locus. Let us consider the open subset $V = \overline{\Gamma} \times ((X^u \times X^v)^o \cap (X^2_w)^o)_{\mathbf{j}}$ of $\overline{\Gamma} \times (X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}$. By the proof of Proposition 6.5, it is easy to see that $(X^v)^o \cap X^o_w$ is smooth. Hence V is smooth. Moreover, since X^u and X_w are normal, the complement

$$C := (\overline{\Gamma} \times (X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}) \setminus V = C_1 \cup C_2$$

has codimension ≥ 2 in $\overline{\Gamma} \times (X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}$, where

$$C_1 := \overline{\Gamma} \times (\Sigma(X^u \times X^v) \cap (X_w^2))_{\mathbf{j}},$$

and

$$C_2 := \overline{\Gamma} \times ((X^u \times X^v) \cap \Sigma(X_w^2))_{\mathbf{j}}.$$

By the proof of Lemma 6.11, $m_{|C_1}$ is flat with image an open subset of $\widetilde{X_w^2}$. Thus, $C_1 \cap \mathcal{Z}$ is of codimension ≥ 2 in $\mathcal{Z}$. Of course, $m_{|C_2}$ has image contained in $\widetilde{\Sigma(X_w^2)}$. Hence, $C_2 \cap \mathcal{Z}$ is of codimension ≥ 2 in $\mathcal{Z}$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{Z}_o := \mathcal{Z} \setminus C = V \cap \mathcal{Z}$$

is an open subset of $\mathcal{Z}$ with its complement of codimension ≥ 2 in $\mathcal{Z}$.

By the same proof as that of Lemma 6.10, we get that $m_{|V}$ is smooth with an open (dense) subset of $\widetilde{(X_w^2)}^o$ as its image, which intersects $\tilde{\Delta}(\widetilde{X_w^o})$ in a nonempty set. Hence, the map

$$\mu_{|\mathcal{Z}_o} : \mathcal{Z}_o \to \tilde{\Delta}(\widetilde{X_w^o}) = \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)^o$$

is a smooth morphism. Since $\mu_{|\mathcal{Z}_o}$ is a smooth morphism and $\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)^o$ is smooth, we get that $\mathcal{Z}_o$ is smooth. This proves the lemma. □

Define the r-tuple $C^{\mathbf{j}} = (c_1, \ldots, c_r)$ by $c_i = N + 1 - j_i$, where $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \ldots, j_r)$. Recall that $\mathcal{Z}$ is irreducible, normal and CM by Lemma 7.5. Let $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\rho \boxtimes \rho)$ be the pull-back of the line bundle $\hat{\mathcal{L}}(\rho \boxtimes \rho)$ on $\overline{\tilde{Y}}$ (defined just before Lemma 4.5) via the canonical projection $\mu : \mathcal{Z} \to \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w) \subset \overline{\tilde{Y}}$ and p is the projection $\mathcal{Z} \to \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}$ (obtained as the composite $\mathcal{Z} \xrightarrow{i} \overline{\Gamma} \times (X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}} \to (X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}} \xrightarrow{p_1} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}$, where the second map is the projection on the $(X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}$-factor).

8.2 Lemma. *For the dualizing sheaf $\omega_{\mathcal{Z}}$ of $\mathcal{Z}$,*

$$\omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial \mathcal{Z}) \simeq \mu^* \left(\omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)} \right) \otimes \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\rho \boxtimes \rho) \otimes p^* \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(C^{\mathbf{j}} \partial \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}),$$

where $\omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial \mathcal{Z})$ denotes the sheaf $\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}}(\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}(-\partial \mathcal{Z}), \omega_{\mathcal{Z}})$.

(Since μ is a flat map, $\mu^* \left(\omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)} \right)$ makes good 'functorial' sense.)

Proof. First observe that

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}} \simeq \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-D^{\mathbf{j}} \partial \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}), \tag{48}$$

where $D^{\mathbf{j}} = (d_1, \ldots, d_r)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} d_i &= j_i + 1, \quad \text{if} \quad j_i > 0 \\ &= 0, \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}} = \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(-(N+1)\mathbb{I} \partial \mathbb{P}), \tag{49}$$

where $(N+1)\mathbb{I} = (N+1, \dots, N+1)$.

In the following, $\bar{\omega}_{X_w^{u,v}/X_w^2}$ is the sheaf on $(X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}$ defined as $E(T)_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}} \overset{T}{\times} \omega_{X_w^{u,v}/X_w^2}$ for the inclusion $X_w^{u,v} \hookrightarrow X_w^2$, $\partial X_w^{u,v} := (\partial X^{u,v}) \cap X_w^2$, and k is the inclusion $(X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}} \hookrightarrow (X^u \times X^v)_{\mathbf{j}}$. As in Lemma 8.1, let $\mathcal{Z}_o \subset \mathcal{Z}$ be the smooth open subset such that $\mu_{|\mathcal{Z}_o} : \mathcal{Z}_o \to \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)^o$ is a smooth morphism. We have the following identifications restricted to the open subset $\mathcal{Z}_o$ (using Lemma 7.1):

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_{\mathcal{Z}} &= \mu^* \omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)} \otimes \omega_{\mathcal{Z}/\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)} \\
&\simeq \mu^* \omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)} \otimes i^* \left(\omega_{\bar{\Gamma} \times (X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}} / \widetilde{X_w^2}} \right) \\
&\simeq \mu^* \omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)} \otimes i^* \left(\mathscr{O}_{\bar{\Gamma}} \boxtimes \left(\bar{\omega}_{X_w^{u,v}/X_w^2} \otimes p_1^* \omega_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}} \otimes p_1^* \omega_{\mathbb{P}}^{-1} \right) \right) \\
&\simeq \mu^* \omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)} \otimes i^* \left(\mathscr{O}_{\bar{\Gamma}} \boxtimes \mathscr{O}_{(X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}} \left(-(\partial X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}} \right) \right) \\
&\quad \otimes \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\rho \boxtimes \rho) \otimes p^*(\omega_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}} \otimes \omega_{\mathbb{P}}^{-1}), \quad \text{by Theorem 10.4, since } \bar{\omega}_{X_w^{u,v}/X_w^2} \simeq k^*(\bar{\omega}_{X^{u,v}/\bar{X}^2}) \\
&\simeq \mu^* \omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)} \otimes i^* \left(\mathscr{O}_{\bar{\Gamma}} \boxtimes \mathscr{O}_{(X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}} \left(-(\partial X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}} \right) \right) \\
&\quad \otimes \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\rho \boxtimes \rho) \otimes p^* \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}} \left((-D^{\mathbf{j}} + (N+1)\mathbb{I}) \partial \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}} \right), \quad \text{by (48), (49)} \\
&\simeq \mu^* \omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\rho \boxtimes \rho) \otimes p^* \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(C^{\mathbf{j}} \partial \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}) \otimes \\
&\quad i^* \mathscr{O}_{\bar{\Gamma} \times (X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}} \left(-\bar{\Gamma} \times \partial((X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}) \right), \quad \text{since } \partial((X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}) := (\partial X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}} \cup (X_w^{u,v})_{\partial \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, restricted to the open subset $\mathcal{Z}_o$,

$$\omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial \mathcal{Z}) \simeq \mu^* \omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\rho \boxtimes \rho) \otimes p^* \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(C^{\mathbf{j}} \partial \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}).$$

Now, since the complement of $\mathcal{Z}_o$ in $\mathcal{Z}$ is of codimension ≥ 2, $\mathcal{Z}$ is irreducible, normal and CM (cf. Lemma 7.5), the subscheme $\partial \mathcal{Z}$ is CM and pure of codimension 1 in $\mathcal{Z}$ (cf. Proposition 7.6), μ is a flat morphism and $\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)$ is CM, we get that the above isomorphism holds on all of $\mathcal{Z}$. This proves the lemma. ◻

By a similar argument, we get the following.

8.3 Lemma.

$$\omega_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\partial \mathcal{Z}') \simeq \mu'^* \omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\rho \boxtimes \rho) \otimes \varphi'^* p^* (\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(C^{\mathbf{j}} \partial \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}})),$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\rho \boxtimes \rho)$ is the pull-back of the line bundle $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\rho \boxtimes \rho)$ via φ',

$$\partial \mathcal{Z}' := \left(\bar{\Gamma} \times \partial \left((X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}} \right) \right) \underset{\widetilde{X_w^2}}{\times} \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w),$$

and $\omega_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\partial \mathcal{Z}')$ denotes the sheaf $\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}}(\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}(-\partial \mathcal{Z}'), \omega_{\mathcal{Z}'})$.

8.4 Corollary. $\varphi'_* \omega_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\partial \mathcal{Z}') = \omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial \mathcal{Z})$.

Proof. By Lemma 8.3,

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi'_*\omega_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\partial\mathcal{Z}') &= (\varphi'_*\mu'^*\omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)})\otimes\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\rho\boxtimes\rho)\otimes p^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(C^{\mathbf{j}}\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}), \ \text{ by the projection formula}\\ &= (\mu^* j_*\omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)})\otimes\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\rho\boxtimes\rho)\otimes p^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(C^{\mathbf{j}}\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}), \ \text{ by [H, Proposition 9.3, Chap. III]}\\ &= \mu^*\omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)}\otimes\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\rho\boxtimes\rho)\otimes p^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(C^{\mathbf{j}}\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}),\end{aligned}$$

where the last identity follows from $j_*\omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)} = \omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)}$ (cf. [BK, Lemma 3.4.2]), since $\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)$ has rational singularities and $j : \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w) \to \tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)$ is a desingularization. This proves the corollary by Lemma 8.2. □

For schemes Y, Z with divisors $\partial Y, \partial Z$ respectively, we set

$$\partial(Y\times Z) := ((\partial Y)\times Z)\cup(Y\times\partial Z).$$

Consider the desingularization

$$\pi_w^{u,v} : Z_w^{u,v} \to X_w^{u,v},$$

which is the Cartesian product of the disingularizations (cf. Theorem 6.7):

$$\pi_w^u\times\pi_w^v : Z_w^{u,v} := Z_w^u\times Z_w^v \to X_w^u\times X_w^v =: X_w^{u,v}.$$

Write $\partial X_w^{u,v}$ and $X^{u,v}\cap\partial(X_w^2)$ (both equipped with the reduced subscheme structure) as the sum of prime divisors:

$$\partial X_w^{u,v} = \sum_{i_1} X_{i_1}$$

and

$$X^{u,v}\cap\partial(X_w^2) = \sum_{j_1} Y_{j_1}$$

and let $\tilde{X}_{i_1}, \tilde{Y}_{j_1}\subset Z_w^{u,v}$ be the strict transforms of X_{i_1}, Y_{j_1} respectively, where $\partial X_w^u := (\partial X^u)\cap X_w$ and $X^{u,v} := X^u\times X^v$.

By [KuS, Theorem 3.2], $(X_w^{u,v}, \Delta)$ is a KLT pair for the divisor Δ (for large enough N), where

$$\Delta = \partial X_w^{u,v} - \frac{1}{N}\mathcal{L}(2\rho\boxtimes 2\rho) + X^{u,v}\cap\partial(X_w^2).$$

Let $E = \mathrm{Exc}(\pi_w^{u,v})\subset Z_w^{u,v}$ be the exceptional set of $\pi_w^{u,v}$ endowed with the reduced subscheme structure. Write E as the sum of prime divisors

$$E = \sum\tilde{X}'_{i_2} + \sum\tilde{Y}'_{j_2},$$

where $\tilde{X}'_{i_2}$ are the prime divisors contained in $(\pi_w^{u,v})^{-1}(\partial X_w^{u,v})$ and $\tilde{Y}'_{j_2}$ are the prime divisors contained in $(\pi_w^{u,v})^{-1}(X^{u,v}\cap\partial(X_w^2))$.

Consider the divisors Z_{i_1}, W_{j_1}, Z'_{i_2}, W'_{j_2} of $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{i_1} &:= \tilde{i}^{-1}\left(\overline{\Gamma} \times (\tilde{X}_{i_1})_{\mathbf{j}}\right)\\
W_{j_1} &:= \tilde{i}^{-1}\left(\overline{\Gamma} \times (\tilde{Y}_{j_1})_{\mathbf{j}}\right)\\
Z'_{i_2} &:= \tilde{i}^{-1}\left(\overline{\Gamma} \times (\tilde{X}'_{i_2})_{\mathbf{j}}\right)\\
W'_{j_2} &:= \tilde{i}^{-1}\left(\overline{\Gamma} \times (\tilde{Y}'_{j_2})_{\mathbf{j}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since, the map $\tilde{m}$ restricted to any of the above subschemes $\overline{\Gamma} \times (\tilde{X}_{i_1})_{\mathbf{j}}, \overline{\Gamma} \times (\tilde{Y}_{j_1})_{\mathbf{j}}, \overline{\Gamma} \times (\tilde{X}'_{i_2})_{\mathbf{j}}$ and $\overline{\Gamma} \times (\tilde{Y}'_{j_2})_{\mathbf{j}}$ is smooth onto its image (by the same proof as that of Lemma 6.10), all of $Z_{i_1}, W_{j_1}, Z'_{i_2}$ and W'_{j_2} are divisors in $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$.

8.5 Lemma. *Let $u \leq w$. As T-equivariant sheaves, the dualizing sheaf*

$$\omega_{X^u_w} \simeq \mathscr{O}_{X^u_w}\left(-\partial X^u_w - X^u \cap \partial(X_w)\right),$$

where recall that $\partial X^u_w := (\partial X^u) \cap X_w$.

Proof. Since X^u_w is CM by Proposition 6.5 (in particular, so is X_w) and the codimension of X^u_w in X_w is $\ell(u)$, the dualizing sheaf

$$\omega_{X^u_w} \simeq \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathscr{O}_{X_w}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u_w}, \omega_{X_w}), \tag{50}$$

(cf. [E, Theorm 21.15]). By the same proof as that of Lemma 5.6 (observing that depth(ω_{X_w}) = depth$(\mathscr{O}_{X_w})$, as $\mathscr{O}_{X_w}$-modules, cf. [E, Theorem 21.8])

$$\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathscr{O}_{X_w}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u_w}, \omega_{X_w}) \simeq \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(u)}_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^u}, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}) \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}} \omega_{X_w}. \tag{51}$$

By [GK, Proposition 2.2], as T-equivariant sheaves,

$$\omega_{X_w} \simeq \mathbb{C}_{-\rho} \otimes \mathcal{L}(-\rho) \otimes \mathscr{O}_{X_w}(-\partial X_w). \tag{52}$$

(Even though we assume that G is of finite type in [GK], but the same proof works for a general Kac-Moody group.) Thus, the lemma follows by combining the isomorphisms (50) - (52) together with Theorem 10.4 (due to Kashiwara). □

8.6 Lemma. *There exist non-negative integers n_{i_2} and m_{j_2} such that*

$$\omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}) \simeq \tilde{\mu}^*\left(\omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)}\right) \otimes \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(\rho \boxtimes \rho) \otimes \tilde{p}^*\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(C^{\mathbf{j}}\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}) \otimes \mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}\left(\sum n_{i_2} Z'_{i_2} + \sum m_{j_2} W'_{j_2}\right),$$

where $\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} := f^{-1}\partial\mathcal{Z}$ (with the reduced subscheme structure), $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(\rho \boxtimes \rho)$ is the pull-back of the line bundle $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\rho \boxtimes \rho)$ via f and $\tilde{p} := p \circ f$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}} &\simeq \omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}/\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)} \otimes \tilde{\mu}^* \left(\omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)}\right) \\
&\simeq \tilde{i}^* \left(\omega_{\overline{\Gamma}\times(Z_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}/\widetilde{Z_w^2}}\right) \otimes \tilde{\mu}^* \left(\omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)}\right) \\
&\simeq \tilde{i}^* \left(\mathscr{O}_{\overline{\Gamma}} \boxtimes \overline{\omega}_{(Z_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}}\right) \otimes \tilde{p}^*(\omega_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}) \otimes \tilde{i}^* \tilde{m}^* \left(\overline{\omega}^{-1}_{\widetilde{Z_w^2}}\right) \otimes \tilde{p}^*(\omega_{\mathbb{P}}^{-1}) \otimes \tilde{\mu}^* \left(\omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)}\right) \\
&\simeq \tilde{i}^* \left(\mathscr{O}_{\overline{\Gamma}} \boxtimes \overline{\omega}_{(Z_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}}\right) \otimes \tilde{i}^* \tilde{m}^* \left(\overline{\omega}^{-1}_{\widetilde{Z_w^2}}\right) \otimes \tilde{p}^* \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(-D^{\mathbf{j}}\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}) \otimes \tilde{p}^* \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}}((N+1)\mathbb{I}\partial\mathbb{P}) \\
&\qquad \otimes \tilde{\mu}^* \left(\omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)}\right), \qquad (53)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{\omega}_{(Z_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}}$ denotes the line bundle on $(Z_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}$ given by $E(T)_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}} \times^T \omega_{Z_w^{u,v}}$ and similarly

$$\overline{\omega}_{\widetilde{Z_w^2}} := E(T)_{\mathbb{P}} \times^T \omega_{Z_w^2}.$$

Now, since $(X_w^{u,v}, \Delta)$ is a KLT pair, we get (by the definition of KLT; also called *log terminal*, as in [D, Definition 7.24]):

$$\omega_{Z_w^{u,v}} = -\sum \tilde{X}_{i_1} - \frac{1}{N}\sum d_{i_2}\tilde{X}'_{i_2} + \sum e_{i_2}\tilde{X}'_{i_2} \quad - \sum \tilde{Y}_{j_1} - \frac{1}{N}\sum d_{j_2}\tilde{Y}'_{j_2} + \sum e_{j_2}\tilde{Y}'_{j_2}, \qquad (54)$$

for some integers $d_{i_2}, d_{j_2} > 0$ (which are independent of N); rational numbers $e_{i_2}, e_{j_2} > -1$; and $N \gg 0$.

Here we have used the result (cf. Lemma 8.5) that

$$\omega_{X_w^{u,v}} = \mathscr{O}_{X_w^{u,v}}\left(-\partial X_w^{u,v} - X^{u,v} \cap \partial(X_w^2)\right).$$

Also, recall [BK, Proposition 2.2.2] that as a T-equivariant line bundle,

$$\omega_{Z_w^2} \simeq \mathscr{O}_{Z_w^2}(-\partial Z_w^2) \otimes \mathcal{L}_{Z_w^2}(-\rho \boxtimes -\rho) \otimes e^{-2\rho}, \qquad (55)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{Z_w^2}(-\rho \boxtimes -\rho)$ denotes the pull-back of the line bundle $\mathcal{L}(-\rho \boxtimes -\rho)$ via the map $Z_w^2 \to \overline{X}^2$.

Thus, by (53) - (55), we get

$$\begin{gathered}
\omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}) \simeq \mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}\left(\sum\left(1 - \frac{d_{i_2}}{N} + e_{i_2}\right)Z'_{i_2} + \sum\left(1 - \frac{d_{j_2}}{N} + e_{j_2}\right)W'_{j_2}\right) \\
\otimes \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(\rho \boxtimes \rho) \otimes \tilde{p}^* \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}}(C^{\mathbf{j}}\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}) \otimes \tilde{\mu}^* \left(\omega_{\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{Z}_w)}\right).
\end{gathered}$$

Now, since $\omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})$ is a line bundle, and $e_{i_2}, e_{j_2} > -1$, we get that (for $N \gg 0$)

$$1 - \frac{d_{i_2}}{N} + e_{i_2} \quad \text{and} \quad 1 - \frac{d_{j_2}}{N} + e_{j_2} \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

Thus, taking

$$n_{i_2} := 1 - \frac{d_{i_2}}{N} + e_{i_2}; \quad m_{j_2} := 1 - \frac{d_{j_2}}{N} + e_{j_2},$$

we get the lemma. □

8.7 Lemma. *For any non-negative integers* n_{i_2},

$$f'_*\left(\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}\left(\sum_{i_2} n_{i_2} Z'_{i_2}\right)\right) = \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}.$$

Proof. Let F be the divisor $\sum_{i_2} n_{i_2} Z'_{i_2}$. Then, we have the inclusions:

$$\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}} \hookrightarrow \mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(F) \hookrightarrow i'_*\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \setminus \operatorname{Supp} F}, \tag{56}$$

where $i' : \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \setminus \operatorname{Supp} F \hookrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is the inclusion.

By the same proof as that of Proposition 7.4, $\mathcal{Z}'$ is irreducible and $f' : \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \to \mathcal{Z}'$ is a proper birational morphism.

By definition, $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} := \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \setminus \operatorname{Exc}(f')$ is the largest open subset of $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ such that

$$f'_{|\tilde{\mathcal{U}}} : \tilde{\mathcal{U}} \xrightarrow{\sim} f'(\tilde{\mathcal{U}})$$

is an isomorphism onto the open subset $\mathcal{U} := f'(\tilde{\mathcal{U}})$ of $\mathcal{Z}'$. Then, the complement $\mathcal{Z}' \setminus \mathcal{U}$ is a (closed) subset of $\mathcal{Z}'$ of codimension ≥ 2. Moreover, we can see that $\operatorname{Supp} F \subset \operatorname{Exc}(f')$. Thus, we get from (56):

$$\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}} \hookrightarrow \mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(F) \hookrightarrow i_*\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}}, \tag{57}$$

where $i : \tilde{\mathcal{U}} \hookrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is the inclusion.

Taking f'_* of the above sequence (57), we get

$$f'_*\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}} \hookrightarrow f'_*(\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(F)) \hookrightarrow f'_* i_*\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}}. \tag{58}$$

But, since f' is a proper birational morphism and $\mathcal{Z}'$ is normal (by Lemma 7.5), by Zariski's main theorem,

$$f'_*\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}} = \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}. \tag{59}$$

Moreover, since $f' \circ i : \tilde{\mathcal{U}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{U}$ is an isomorphism and $\mathcal{Z}' \setminus \mathcal{U}$ is of codimension ≥ 2, we get that

$$f'_* i_*\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}} = \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}. \tag{60}$$

Combining the equations (58) – (60), we get

$$\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'} \hookrightarrow f'_*(\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(F)) \hookrightarrow \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}.$$

Thus, we get

$$f'_*(\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(F)) = \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'},$$

proving the lemma. □

8.8 Lemma. *The line bundle $\mathcal{L}(\rho)_{|X^u}$ has a section with the zero set precisely equal to ∂X^u.*

In particular,

$$\mathcal{L}(\rho)_{|X^u_w} \sim \sum_i b_i X_i, \quad b_i > 0,$$

where X_i are the irreducible components of $(\partial X^u) \cap X_w$.

Proof. Consider the Borel-Weil isomorphism $\chi : L(\rho)^\vee \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(\bar{X}, \mathcal{L}(\rho))$ given by $\chi(f)(gB) = [g, f(ge_\rho)]$, where e_ρ is a highest weight vector of the irreducible highest weight $G^{\min}$-module $L(\rho)$ with highest weight ρ and $L(\rho)^\vee$ is the restricted dual of $L(\rho)$ (cf. [K, §8.1.21]). Then, it is easy to see that the section $\chi(e^*_{u\rho})_{|X^u}$ has the zero set exactly equal to ∂X^u, where $e_{u\rho}$ is the extremal weight vector of $L(\rho)$ with weight $u\rho$ and $e^*_{u\rho} \in L(\rho)^\vee$ is the linear form which takes value 1 on $e_{u\rho}$ and 0 on any weight vector of $L(\rho)$ of weight different from $u\rho$. This proves the lemma. □

A $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D on an irreducible projective variety X is called *nef* (resp. *big*) if D has nonnegative intersection with every curve in X (resp. if $\dim H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(mD)) > cm^{\dim X}$, for some $c > 0$ and $m >> 1$). If D is ample, it is nef and big.

Let $\pi : X \to Y$ be a proper morphism between schemes and let D be a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X. Assume that X is irreducible. Then, D is said to be *π-nef* (resp. *π-big*) if D has nonnegative intersection with every curve in X contracted by π (resp. if rank $\pi_* \mathcal{O}_X(mD) > cm^n$ for some $c > 0$ and $m >> 1$, where n is the dimension of a general fiber of π).

8.9 Proposition. *There exists a nef and big line bundle $\mathcal{M}$ on $(Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}$ with a section with support precisely equal to $\partial\left((Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}\right)$, where $\partial\left((Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}\right)$ is, by definition, the inverse image of $\partial\left((X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}\right)$ under the canonical map $(Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}} \to (X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}$ induced from the T-equivariant map $\pi^{u,v}_w$.*

Moreover, such a line bundle $\mathcal{M}$ can be chosen to be the pull-back of an ample line bundle $\mathcal{M}'$ on $(X^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}$.

Proof. Take an ample line bundle $\mathcal{H}$ on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}$ with a section with support precisely equal to $\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}$. Also, let $\mathcal{L}_{Z^{u,v}_w}(\rho \boxtimes \rho)$ be the pull-back of the line bundle $\mathcal{L}(\rho) \boxtimes \mathcal{L}(\rho)$ on $\bar{X} \times \bar{X}$ via the standard morphism

$$Z^{u,v}_w \to \bar{X} \times \bar{X}.$$

Since, $e^{u\rho+v\rho}\mathcal{L}_{Z^{u,v}_w}(\rho \boxtimes \rho)$ is a T-equivariant line bundle, we get the line bundle $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(-\rho \boxtimes -\rho) := E(T)_{\mathbf{j}} \times^T \left(e^{u\rho+v\rho}\mathcal{L}_{Z^{u,v}_w}(\rho \boxtimes \rho)\right) \to (Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}$ over the base space $(Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}$. Now, consider the line bundle (for some large enough $N > 0$):

$$\mathcal{M} := \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(-\rho \boxtimes -\rho) \otimes \pi^*(\mathcal{H}^N),$$

where $\pi : E(T)_{\mathbf{j}} \times^T Z^{u,v}_w \to \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}$ is the canonical projection. Take the section θ of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(-\rho \boxtimes -\rho)$ given by $[e, z] \mapsto [e, 1_{u\rho+v\rho} \otimes (\bar{\chi}(e^*_{u\rho}) \boxtimes \bar{\chi}(e^*_{v\rho}))(z)]$ for $e \in E(T)_{\mathbf{j}}$ and $z \in Z^{u,v}_w$, where $\bar{\chi} \boxtimes \bar{\chi}$ is the pull-back of the Borel-Weil isomorphism $\chi \boxtimes \chi : L(\rho)^\vee \otimes L(\rho)^\vee \simeq H^0(\bar{X}^2, \mathcal{L}(\rho) \boxtimes \mathcal{L}(\rho))$ to $Z^{u,v}_w$ (cf. proof of Lemma 8.8). Also, take any section σ of $\mathcal{H}^N$ with its zero set precisely equal to $\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}$ and let $\hat{\sigma}$ be its pull-back to $(Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}$. Then, the zero set of the tensor product of these sections θ and $\hat{\sigma}$ is precisely equal to $\partial\left((Z^{u,v}_w)_{\mathbf{j}}\right)$ (cf. proof of Lemma 8.8).

The line bundle $\mathcal{M}$ is the pull-back of the line bundle $\mathcal{M}' := \tilde{\mathcal{L}}'(-\rho \boxtimes -\rho) \otimes \pi_1^*(\mathcal{H}^N)$ on $E(T)_{\mathbf{j}} \overset{T}{\times} X_w^{u,v}$ via the standard morphism

$$E(T)_{\mathbf{j}} \overset{T}{\times} Z_w^{u,v} \to E(T)_{\mathbf{j}} \overset{T}{\times} X_w^{u,v},$$

where π_1 is the projection $E(T)_{\mathbf{j}} \overset{T}{\times} X_w^{u,v} \to \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}'(-\rho \boxtimes -\rho)$ is the line bundle

$$E(T)_{\mathbf{j}} \overset{T}{\times} \left(e^{u\rho+v\rho}(\mathcal{L}(\rho) \boxtimes \mathcal{L}(\rho))_{|X_w^{u,v}}\right).$$

Then, by [KM, Proposition 1.45 and Theorems 1.37 and 1.42], $\mathcal{M}'$ is ample on $(X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}$ for large enough N. Since the pull-back of an ample line bundle via a birational morphism is nef and big (cf. [D, §1.29]), $\mathcal{M}$ is nef and big. This proves the proposition. ☐

We recall the following 'relative Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem' (cf. [D, Exercise 2 on page 217]); replace Debarre's D by D', take $D/N = \lceil D' \rceil - D'$ and $\mathcal{L} = D' + D/N$.

8.10 Theorem. *Let $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{Z} \to \overline{\Gamma}$ be a proper surjective morphism of varieties with $\tilde{Z}$ a smooth variety. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a line bundle on $\tilde{Z}$ such that $\mathcal{L}^N(-D)$ is $\tilde{\pi}$-nef and $\tilde{\pi}$-big for a normal crossing divisor*

$$D = \sum_i a_i D_i, \quad \textit{where} \quad 0 < a_i < N, \quad \textit{for all} \quad i.$$

Then,

$$R^p\tilde{\pi}_*(\mathcal{L} \otimes \omega_{\tilde{Z}}) = 0, \quad \textit{for all} \quad p > 0.$$

☐

8.11 Proposition. *For the morphism $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \to \overline{\Gamma}$ (cf. the big diagram in Section 7),*

$$R^p\tilde{\pi}_*(\omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})) = 0, \;\; \textit{for all} \;\; p > 0.$$

Proof. Fix a nef and big line bundle $\mathcal{M}$ on $(Z_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}$ with its divisor $\sum_i b_i Z_i$ (with $b_i > 0$) supported precisely in $\partial\left((Z_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}\right)$, which is the pull-back of an ample line bundle $\mathcal{M}'$ on $(X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}$ (cf. Proposition 8.9). Choose an integer $N > b_i$, for all i. Consider the line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ corresponding to the reduced divisor $\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ and let D be the divisor on $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$:

$$D = \sum_i (N - b_i)\tilde{Z}_i,$$

where

$$\tilde{Z}_i := (\overline{\Gamma} \times Z_i) \underset{\tilde{Z}_w^2}{\times} \tilde{\Delta}\left(\tilde{Z}_w\right).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^N(-D) &= \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}\left(\sum_i b_i \tilde{Z}_i\right) \\ &\simeq \tilde{i}^*\left(\mathcal{O}_{\overline{\Gamma} \times (Z_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}}(\sum b_i \overline{\Gamma} \times Z_i)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the divisor $\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} = \sum_i \tilde{Z}_i$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is a normal crossing divisor by Theorems 6.3, 6.7 and Lemma 6.10. Moreover, since $\sum b_i Z_i$ is a nef divisor on $(Z_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}$ and $\tilde{i}$ is injective, $\mathcal{L}^N(-D)$ is $\tilde{\pi}$-nef.

Observe further that, by definition, the line bundle $\mathcal{L}^N(-D)$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is the pull-back of the line bundle $\mathcal{S} := i^*(\epsilon \boxtimes \mathcal{M}')$ on $\mathcal{Z}$ via f, where ϵ is the trivial line bundle on $\overline{\Gamma}$. Now, $\mathcal{M}'$ being an ample line bundle on $(X_w^{u,v})_{\mathbf{j}}$, $\mathcal{S}$ is π-big. But, f being birational, the general fibers of $\tilde{\pi}$ have the same dimension as the general fibers of π (use [S, Theorem 7, §6.3, Chap. I]). Hence, $\mathcal{L}^N(-D)$ is $\tilde{\pi}$-big.

The map f is surjective since it is proper and birational by Proposition 7.4. Also, the map $\tilde{\pi}$ is surjective since so is π (cf. the proof of Corollary 7.7). Thus, by Theorem 8.10, the proposition follows. ◻

8.12 Theorem. *For the morphism* $f : \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \to \mathcal{Z}$,

(a) $R^p f_* \left(\omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})\right) = 0$, *for all* $p > 0$, *and*

(b) $f_*(\omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})) = \omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial\mathcal{Z})$.

Proof. The map f is surjective as observed above. Following the notation in the proof of Proposition 8.11, $\mathcal{L}^N(-D)$ is $\tilde{\pi}$-nef and $\tilde{\pi}$-big. Since the fibers of f are contained in the fibers of $\tilde{\pi}$, $\mathcal{L}^N(-D)$ is f-nef. Moreover, since f is birational, clearly $\mathcal{L}^N(-D)$ is f-big. Now, applying Theorem 8.10 to the morphism $f : \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \to \mathcal{Z}$, we get the (a) part of the proposition.

By the definition of W'_{j_2}, there exists a prime Cartier divisor $V_{j_2} \subset \mathcal{Z}'$, which is the pull-back of a prime divisor contained in the exceptional locus of $\tilde{\Delta}\tilde{Z}_w \to \tilde{\Delta}\tilde{X}_w$ under μ', such that

$$\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(W'_{j_2}) \simeq f'^* \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}(V_{j_2}).$$

Thus, for any non-negative integers n_{i_2} and m_{j_2},

$$\begin{aligned} f'_*\left(\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}\left(\sum_{i_2} n_{i_2} Z'_{i_2} + \sum_{j_2} m_{j_2} W'_{j_2}\right)\right) &\simeq \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}\left(\sum_{j_2} m_{j_2} V_{j_2}\right) \otimes f'_*\left(\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}\left(\sum_{i_2} n_{i_2} Z'_{i_2}\right)\right) \\ &\simeq \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}\left(\sum_{j_2} m_{j_2} V_{j_2}\right), \quad \text{by Lemma 8.7.} \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

Let F' be the divisor $\sum_{j_2} m_{j_2} V_{j_2}$. Then, we claim that

$$\varphi'_*(\omega_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\partial\mathcal{Z}') \otimes \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}(F')) \simeq \omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial\mathcal{Z}). \tag{62}$$

To prove (62), we essentially follow the proof of Lemma 8.7. We have the inclusions:

$$\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'} \hookrightarrow \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}(F') \hookrightarrow j'_* \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}' \setminus \operatorname{Supp} F'},$$

where $j' : \mathcal{Z}' \setminus \operatorname{Supp} F' \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z}'$ is the inclusion. Observe that $\operatorname{Supp} F'$ is contained in the exceptional set $\operatorname{Exc}(\varphi')$ of $\varphi' : \mathcal{Z}' \to \mathcal{Z}$. Thus,

$$\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'} \hookrightarrow \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}(F') \hookrightarrow j_* \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}' \setminus \operatorname{Exc} \varphi'},$$

where $j : \mathcal{Z}'\setminus \operatorname{Exc}\varphi' \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z}'$ is the inclusion. Let E' be the image of $\operatorname{Exc}\varphi'$ under φ' and let $q : \mathcal{Z}\setminus E' \to \mathcal{Z}$ be the inclusion. Tensoring the above sequence with $\omega_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\partial\mathcal{Z}')$ (which is a line bundle by Lemma 8.3), and then taking φ'_*, we get (by Corollary 8.4)

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial\mathcal{Z}) &\simeq \varphi'_*(\omega_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\partial\mathcal{Z}')) \hookrightarrow \varphi'_*(\omega_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\partial\mathcal{Z}')\otimes \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}(F'))\\ &\hookrightarrow \varphi'_*(j_*(\omega_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\partial\mathcal{Z}')_{|\mathcal{Z}'\setminus \operatorname{Exc}\varphi'})) \simeq q_*(\omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial\mathcal{Z})_{|\mathcal{Z}\setminus E'})\\ &\simeq \omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial\mathcal{Z}), \end{aligned}\tag{63}$$

where the last isomorphism follows from Lemma 8.2 and the isomorphism (52), since they coincide on an open subset of the CM normal scheme $\mathcal{Z}$ with complement of codimension ≥ 2. Thus, the isomorphism (62) is proved.

By the same proof as that of Proposition 7.4, $\mathcal{Z}'$ is irreducible and $f' : \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \to \mathcal{Z}'$ is a proper birational morphism.

Since $f := \varphi' \circ f'$, we get by Lemmas 8.3, 8.6 and the projection formula,

$$\begin{aligned} f_*(\omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})) &= \varphi'_* \circ f'_*(\omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}(\partial\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}))\\ &\simeq \varphi'_*\left(\omega_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\partial\mathcal{Z}')\otimes f'_*\mathscr{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}\left(\sum_{i_2} n_{i_2}Z'_{i_2} + \sum_{j_2} m_{j_2}W'_{j_2}\right)\right)\\ &\simeq \varphi'_*(\omega_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\partial\mathcal{Z}')\otimes\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}'}(F')), \quad \text{by the isomorphism (61)}\\ &\simeq \omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial\mathcal{Z}), \quad \text{by the isomorphism (62).}\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 8.12(b). □

As an immediate consequence of Proposition 8.11, Theorem 8.12 and the Grothendieck spectral sequence (cf. [J, Proposition 4.1, Part I]), we get the following:

8.13 Corollary. *Let $\pi : \mathcal{Z} \to \bar{\Gamma}$ be the morphism as in the big diagram in Section 7. Then,*

$$R^p\pi_*(\omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial\mathcal{Z})) = 0, \quad \textit{for all} \quad p > 0.$$

9 Proof of Theorem 4.10 (b)

By using Kashiwara's result: $\xi^u = \mathscr{O}_{X^u}(-\partial X^u)$ (cf. Theorem 10.4), and the fact that for closed subschemes A_1, A_2 of a scheme A,

$$\mathscr{O}_{A_1}\otimes_{\mathscr{O}_A}\mathscr{O}_{A_2} \simeq \mathscr{O}_{A_1\cap A_2},$$

Theorem 4.10 (b) is clearly equivalent to the following vanishing:

9.1 Theorem. *For general $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}$,*

$$H^p\left(X^{u,v}_{\mathbf{j}} \cap \gamma\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w), \mathscr{O}(-\bar{M}_\gamma)\right) = 0, \ \ \textit{for all}\ \ p \neq |\mathbf{j}| + \ell(w) - \ell(u) - \ell(v),$$

where $\bar{M}_\gamma := M_{\gamma^{-1}}$ *is the subscheme* $\left(\partial(X^{u,v}_{\mathbf{j}})\right) \cap \gamma\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)$ *and (as earlier)*

$$\partial\left(X^{u,v}_{\mathbf{j}}\right) := (\partial X^u \times X^v)_{\mathbf{j}} \cup (X^u \times \partial X^v)_{\mathbf{j}} \cup (X^u \times X^v)_{\partial\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{j}}},$$

and $\mathscr{O}(-\bar{M}_\gamma)$ *denotes the ideal sheaf of* $\bar{M}_\gamma$ *in* $X^{u,v}_{\mathbf{j}} \cap \gamma\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)$.

Proof. By Lemma 7.5 and Proposition 7.6, $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\partial\mathcal{Z}$ are CM and $\partial\mathcal{Z}$ is pure of codimension 1 in $\mathcal{Z}$. Thus, $\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}(-\partial\mathcal{Z})$ is a CM $\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}$-module, giving the vanishing:

$$\mathscr{E}xt^i_{\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}}\left(\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}(-\partial\mathcal{Z}), \omega_{\mathcal{Z}}\right) = 0, \quad \text{for all} \quad i \geq 1. \tag{64}$$

Also, by Corollary 7.7, for general $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}$,

$$\mathscr{E}xt^i_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{N}_\gamma}}\left(\mathscr{O}_{\bar{N}_\gamma}(-\bar{M}_\gamma), \omega_{\bar{N}_\gamma}\right) = 0, \quad \text{for all} \quad i > 0,$$

where $\bar{N}_\gamma := N_{\gamma^{-1}}$ is the subscheme $(X^{u,v}_{\mathbf{j}}) \cap \gamma\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{X}_w)$.

Hence, by the Serre duality (cf. [H, Theorem 7.6, Chap. III]) and the local to global Ext spectral sequence (cf. [Go, Théorème 7.3.3, Chap. II]), the theorem is equivalent to the vanishing (for general $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}$) :

$$H^p\left(\bar{N}_\gamma, \mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{N}_\gamma}}\left(\mathscr{O}_{\bar{N}_\gamma}(-\bar{M}_\gamma), \omega_{\bar{N}_\gamma}\right)\right) = 0, \quad \text{for all } p > 0, \tag{65}$$

since (for general $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}$) $\dim \bar{N}_\gamma = |\mathbf{j}| + \ell(w) - \ell(u) - \ell(v)$ (cf. Corollary 7.7).

For general $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial\mathcal{Z})_{|\pi^{-1}(\gamma^{-1})} &\simeq \omega_{\pi^{-1}(\gamma^{-1})}(\partial\mathcal{Z} \cap \pi^{-1}(\gamma^{-1})) \\ &= \omega_{\bar{N}_\gamma}(\bar{M}_\gamma). \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

To prove the above, observe first that by [S, Theorem 7, §6.3, Chap. I] and [H, Exercise 10.9, Chap. III], there exists an open nonempty subset $\bar{\Gamma}_o \subset \bar{\Gamma}$ such that $\pi : \pi^{-1}(\bar{\Gamma}_o) \to \bar{\Gamma}_o$ is a flat morphism. Now, since $\bar{\Gamma}_o$ is smooth and $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\partial\mathcal{Z}$ are CM, and the assertion is local, it suffices to observe that for a nonzero function θ on $\bar{\Gamma}_o$, the sheaf

$$\mathcal{S}/\theta \cdot \mathcal{S} = \mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}_\theta}}(\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}(-\partial\mathcal{Z})/\theta \cdot \mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}(-\partial\mathcal{Z}), \omega_{\mathcal{Z}_\theta}),$$

where $\mathcal{Z}_\theta$ denotes the zero scheme of θ in $\mathcal{Z}$ and the sheaf $\mathcal{S} := \mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}}\left(\mathscr{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}(-\partial\mathcal{Z}), \omega_{\mathcal{Z}}\right)$. Choosing θ to be in a local coordinate system, we can continue and get (66).

Now, the vanishing of $R^p\pi_*(\omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial\mathcal{Z}))$ for $p > 0$ (cf. Corollary 8.13) implies the following vanishing, for general $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}$,

$$H^p\left(\bar{N}_\gamma, \omega_{\bar{N}_\gamma}(\bar{M}_\gamma)\right) = 0, \quad \text{for all} \quad p > 0. \tag{67}$$

To prove this, since $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\partial\mathcal{Z}$ are CM, $\bar{\Gamma}_o$ is smooth and $\pi : \pi^{-1}(\bar{\Gamma}_o) \to \bar{\Gamma}_o$ is flat, observe that $\omega_{\mathcal{Z}}(\partial\mathcal{Z})$ is flat over the base $\bar{\Gamma}_o$. Hence, (67) folows from the semicontinuity theorem (cf. [H, Theorem 12.8 and Corollary 12.9, Chap. III] or [Ke, Theorem 13.1]).

Thus, by (65), the theorem follows and hence Theorem 4.10 (b) is established. □

Appendix by Masaki Kashiwara

10 Determination of the dualizing sheaf of X^v

Let $v \in W$. Set $\mathfrak{C}^v := \bigcup_{y \in W,\, \ell(y) \leq \ell(v)+1} C^y$, where $C^y := B^- yB/B \subset \overline{X}$. (By definition, $\mathfrak{C}^v$ only depends upon $\ell(v)$.) Then, $\mathfrak{C}^v$ is an open subset of $\overline{X}$. Moreover, $X^v \cap \mathfrak{C}^v$ is a smooth scheme, since X^v is normal ([KS, Proposition 3.2]) and any B^--orbit in $X^v \cap \mathfrak{C}^v$ is of codimension ≤ 1. Recall from Section 3, the definition of

$$\xi^v := e^{-\rho}\mathcal{L}(\rho)\omega_{X^v} = e^{-\rho}\mathcal{L}(-\rho)\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(v)}_{\mathscr{O}_{\overline{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^v}, \mathscr{O}_{\overline{X}}).$$

Since $\mathscr{O}_{X^v}$ is a CM ring (cf. [KS, Proposition 3.4]), we have that ξ^v is a CM $\mathscr{O}_{X^v}$-module. Also, since $X^v \cap \mathfrak{C}^v$ is a smooth scheme, $\xi^v|_{\mathfrak{C}^v}$ is an invertible $(\mathscr{O}_{X^v}|_{\mathfrak{C}^v})$-module.

For any $y \in W$, let $i_y : \{\mathrm{pt}\} \to \overline{X}$ be the morphism given by $\mathrm{pt} \mapsto yx_o$. Then, we have (as an H-module):

$$i_y^*\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \simeq \mathbb{C}_{-y\lambda}, \quad \text{for any character } \lambda \text{ of } H. \tag{68}$$

Let $\pi_i : \overline{X} \to \overline{X}_i$ be the projection as in the proof of Proposition 3.5.

10.1 Lemma. *On some B^--stable neighborhood of C^v, we have a B^--equivariant isomorphism $\xi^v \simeq \mathscr{O}_{X^v}$.*

Proof. Since $\xi^v|_{\mathfrak{C}^v}$ is an invertible B^--equivariant $\mathscr{O}_{X^v}|_{\mathfrak{C}^v}$-module, it is enough to show that $i_v^*\xi^v \simeq \mathbb{C}$ as an H-module. This follows from $i_v^*(\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(v)}_{\mathscr{O}_{\overline{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^v}, \mathscr{O}_{\overline{X}})) \simeq \det(T_{vx_o}\overline{X}/T_{vx_o}X^v) \simeq \mathbb{C}_{\rho - v\rho}$ and $i_v^*\mathcal{L}(-\rho) \simeq \mathbb{C}_{v\rho}$ by (68). □

Set $A_v := \{y \in W : y > v \text{ and } \ell(y) = \ell(v)+1\}$. The above lemma implies that, as B^--equivariant $\mathscr{O}_{\overline{X}}$-modules,

$$\xi^v|_{\mathfrak{C}^v} \simeq \mathscr{O}_{X^v}\Big(\sum_{y \in A_v} m_y X^y\Big)\Big|_{\mathfrak{C}^v}, \tag{69}$$

for some $m_y \in \mathbb{Z}$. Recall that $\partial X^v = \bigcup_{y \in A_v} X^y$.

10.2 Lemma. *We have $\xi^v|_{\mathfrak{C}^v} \simeq \mathscr{O}_{X^v}(-\partial X^v)|_{\mathfrak{C}^v}$, where $\mathscr{O}_{X^v}(-\partial X^v) \subset \mathscr{O}_{X^v}$ is the ideal sheaf of the reduced subscheme ∂X^v of X^v.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of Lemma 10.1. For $y \in A_v$, y is a smooth point of X^v (since $X^v \cap \mathfrak{C}^v$ is smooth). Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} i_y^*(\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(v)}_{\mathscr{O}_{\overline{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^v}, \mathscr{O}_{\overline{X}})) &\simeq \det(T_{yx_o}\overline{X}/T_{yx_o}X^v) \\ &\simeq \det(T_{yx_o}\overline{X}/T_{yx_o}X^y) \otimes \det(T_{yx_o}X^v/T_{yx_o}X^y)^{\otimes(-1)} \\ &\simeq \mathbb{C}_{\rho - y\rho} \otimes \det(T_{yx_o}X^v/T_{yx_o}X^y)^{\otimes(-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain $i_y^*\xi^v \simeq (T_{yx_o}X^v/T_{yx_o}X^y)^{\otimes(-1)}$ as an H-module by (68). On the other hand, we have

$$i_y^*(\mathscr{O}_{X^v}(\sum_{z\in A_v} m_z X^z)) \simeq (T_{yx_o}X^v/T_{yx_o}X^y)^{\otimes m_y}, \quad \text{as an } H\text{-module.}$$

Hence, by (69), we have $m_y = -1$. Note that $T_{yx_o}X^v/T_{yx_o}X^y$ is not a trivial H-module by the following lemma. □

10.3 Lemma. *Let $v, y \in W$ satisfy $v < y$ and $\ell(y) = \ell(v) + 1$. Then,*

$$T_{yx_o}X^v/T_{yx_o}X^y \simeq \mathbb{C}_\beta$$

as H-modules, where β is the positive real root such that $yv^{-1} = s_\beta$.

Proof. We prove this by induction on $\ell(y)$. Take a simple reflection s_i such that $ys_i < y$.
(i) If $vs_i > v$, then we have $y = vs_i$. Thus, $T_{yx_o}X^v/T_{yx_o}X^y \simeq T_{yx_o}\pi_i^{-1}\pi_i(yx_o)$ and hence we have $T_{yx_o}X^v/T_{yx_o}X^y \simeq \mathbb{C}_{-y\alpha_i} \simeq \mathbb{C}_{v\alpha_i} = \mathbb{C}_\beta$.
(ii) If $vs_i < v$, then $\pi_i : X^v \to \overline{X}_i$ is a local embedding at yx_o since $C^v \cup C^y$ is open in X^v, $\pi_i|_{C^v\cup C^y}$ is an injective map onto an open subset of $\pi_i(X^v)$, and $\pi_i(X^v) = \pi_i(X^{vs_i})$ is normal (since $X^{vs_i} \to \pi_i(X^{vs_i})$ is a $\mathbb{P}^1$-fibration and X^{vs_i} is normal by [KS, Proposition 3.2]). Moreover, $\pi_i(X^v)$ is smooth at $\pi_i(yx_o)$ since the B^--orbit of $\pi_i(yx_o)$ is of codimension 1 in $\pi_i(X^v)$. Hence, we have $T_{yx_o}X^v/T_{yx_o}X^y \simeq T_{\pi_i(yx_o)}(\pi_i(X^v))/T_{\pi_i(yx_o)}(\pi_i(X^y)) \simeq T_{ys_ix_o}X^{vs_i}/T_{ys_ix_o}X^{ys_i}$. By the induction hypothesis, it is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}_\beta$. □

Let $j : \mathfrak{C}^v \hookrightarrow \overline{X}$ be the open embedding.

10.4 Theorem. *For any $v \in W$, we have a B^--equivariant isomorphism:*

$$\xi^v \simeq \mathscr{O}_{X^v}(-\partial X^v).$$

Hence, the dualizing sheaf ω_{X^v} of X^v is T-equivariantly isomorphic with

$$\mathbb{C}_\rho \otimes \mathscr{L}(-\rho) \otimes \mathscr{O}_{X^v}(-\partial X^v).$$

Proof. We have a commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \mathscr{O}_{X^v}(-\partial X^v) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathscr{O}_{X^v} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\wr"] & \mathscr{O}_{\partial X^v} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, tail] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & j_*j^{-1}\mathscr{O}_{X^v}(-\partial X^v) \arrow[r] & j_*j^{-1}\mathscr{O}_{X^v} \arrow[r] & j_*j^{-1}\mathscr{O}_{\partial X^v},
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the middle vertical arrow is an isomorphism because X^v is normal and $X^v \setminus \mathfrak{C}^v$ is of codimension ≥ 2 in X^v, and the right vertical arrow is a monomorphism because the closure of $\partial X^v \cap \mathfrak{C}^v$ coincides with ∂X^v. Hence, we have $j_*j^{-1}\mathscr{O}_{X^v}(-\partial X^v) \simeq \mathscr{O}_{X^v}(-\partial X^v)$. On the other hand, since ξ^v is a CM $\mathscr{O}_{X^v}$-module, we have

$$\xi^v \simeq j_*j^{-1}\xi^v \simeq j_*j^{-1}\mathscr{O}_{X^v}(-\partial X^v) \simeq \mathscr{O}_{X^v}(-\partial X^v),$$

where the second isomorphism is due to Lemma 10.2. □

10.5 Corollary. *$\mathscr{O}_{X^v}(-\partial X^v)$ is a CM $\mathscr{O}_{X^v}$-module and $\mathscr{O}_{\partial X^v}$ is a CM ring.*

Proof. Since ξ^v is a CM $\mathscr{O}_{X^v}$-module, so is $\mathscr{O}_{X^v}(-\partial X^v)$ by the above theorem.

Applying the functor $\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\,\cdot\,, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}})$ to the exact sequence:

$$0 \to \mathscr{O}_{X^v}(-\partial X^v) \to \mathscr{O}_{X^v} \to \mathscr{O}_{\partial X^v} \to 0,$$

we obtain $\mathscr{E}xt^k_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{\partial X^v}, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}) = 0$, for $k \neq \ell(v), \ell(v)+1$. We also have an exact sequence:

$$0 \to \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(v)}_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{\partial X^v}, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}) \to \mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(v)}_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{X^v}, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}).$$

Since ∂X^v has codimension $\ell(v)+1$, we have $\mathscr{E}xt^{\ell(v)}_{\mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}}(\mathscr{O}_{\partial X^v}, \mathscr{O}_{\bar{X}}) = 0$. Hence, $\mathscr{O}_{\partial X^v}$ is a CM ring. □

References

[AGM] D. Anderson, S. Griffeth and E. Miller. Positivity and Kleiman transversality in equivariant K-theory of homogeneous spaces, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **13** (2011), 57–84.

[AM] M. Atiyah and I. Macdonald. *Introduction to Commutative Algebra*, Addison-Wesley (1969).

[BM] E. Bierstone and P. Milman. Canonical desingularization in characteristic zero by blowing up the maximum starta of a local invariant, *Invent. Math.* **128** (1997), 207–302.

[B] M. Brion. Positivity in the Grothendieck group of complex flag varieties, *J. of Algebra* **258** (2002), 137–159.

[BK] M. Brion and S. Kumar. *Frobenius Splitting Methods in Geometry and Representation Theory*, Progress in Mathematics Vol. 231, Birkhäuser (2005).

[CG] N. Chriss and V. Ginzburg. *Representation Theory and Complex Geometry*, Birkhäuser (1997).

[D] O. Debarre. *Higher-Dimensional Algebraic Geometry*, Universitext, Springer (2001).

[E] D. Eisenbud. *Commutative Algebra with a View Toward Algebraic Geometry*, GTM (**150**), Springer-Verlag (1995).

[FP] W. Fulton and P. Pragacz. *Schubert Varieties and Degeneracy Loci*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics Vol. 1689, Springer-Verlag, 1998.

[Go] R. Godement. *Topologie Algébrique et Théorie des Faisceaux*, Hermann, Paris, 1958.

[G] J. Goodman. Affine open subsets of algebraic varieties and ample divisors, *Annals of Math.* **89** (1969), 160–183.

[GK] W. Graham and S. Kumar. On positivity in T-equivariant K-theory of flag varieties, *IMRN* Vol. **2008**, (2008).

[H] R. Hartshorne. *Algebraic Geometry*, GTM 52, Springer-Verlag, 1977.

[J] J.C. Jantzen. *Representations of Algebraic Groups* (Second Edition), American Mathematical Society, 2003.

[Ka] M. Kashiwara. The flag manifold of Kac-Moody Lie algebra, in: *Algebraic Analysis, Geometry, and Number Theory* (J-I. Igusa, ed.), The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1989, pp. 161–190.

[KS] M. Kashiwara and M. Shimozono. Equivariant K-theory of affine flag manifolds and affine Grothendieck polynomials, *Duke Math. J.* **148** (2009) no. 3, 501-538.

[Ke] G. Kempf. The Grothendieck-Cousin complex of an induced representation, *Advances in Math.* **29** (1978), 310-396.

[Kl] S. Kleiman. Relative duality for quasi-coherent sheaves, *Compos. Math.* **41** (1980), 39-60.

[KM] J. Kollár and S. Mori. *Birational Geometry of Algebraic Varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics Vol. **134**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1998).

[KK] B. Kostant and S. Kumar. T-equivariant K-theory of generalized flag varieties, *J. Diff. Geometry* **32** (1990), 549–603.

[K] S. Kumar. *Kac-Moody Groups, their Flag Varieties and Representation Theory*, Progress in Mathematics Vol. 204, Birkhäuser (2002).

[KN] S. Kumar and M.S. Narasimhan. Picard group of the moduli spaces of G-bundles, *Math. Annalen* **308** (1997), 155–173.

[KuS] S. Kumar and K. Schwede. Richardson varieties have Kawamata log terminal singularities, *Preprint* (2012).

[LSS] T. Lam, A. Schilling and M. Shimozono. K-theory Schubert calculus of the affine Grassmannian, *Compositio Math.* **146** (2010), 811–852.

[L] S. Lang. *Algebra*, Addison-Wesley (1965).

[M] H. Matsumura. *Commutative Ring Theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics Vol. **8**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1986).

[PS] C. Peskine and L. Szpiro. Dimension projective finie et cohomologie locale, *Publ. Math. I.H.E.S.* **42** (1972), 47–119.

[RY] Z. Reichstein and B. Youssin. Equivariant resolution of points of indeterminacy, *Proc. American Math. Soc.* **130** (2002), 2183–2187.

[S] I. R. Safarevic. *Basic Algebraic Geometry*, Springer-Verlag, 1994.

S.K.: Department of Mathematics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3250, USA (email: shrawan@email.unc.edu)